## **Exhibit C**

	Page 1		Page 3
1	STATE OF MINNESOTA	1	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: It is
2	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	2	10:00 a.m. and we will get started on our Partners in
3		3	Nutrition/Partners in Quality Care hearing. I'd like
4		4	to welcome everyone today to this hearing and I will
5		5	walk through the agenda.
6	In Re the Matter of the Appeal of	6	Our agenda will take place with
7	Partners in Nutrition d/b/a Partners in Quality Care	7	introductions, which we will do in a moment, we will
8		8	have opening statements, then there will be a time for
9		9	the Panel to ask questions, we will provide final
10	The above-entitled matter came on for an	10	statements, and then we will have final words.
11	appeal hearing before the Minnesota Department of	11	I can hear people. Here for the hearing,
12	Education Review Panel via Microsoft Teams, taken	12	we will ask that you mute your mics when people are
13	before Gail M. Hinrichs, Registered Professional	13	speaking.
14	Reporter and Notary Public, on the 23rd day of	14	And we will start with introductions.
15	September, 2022, commencing at approximately 10:00 a.m.	15	Mr. Weinhardt, will you please begin to introduce your
16		16	team.
17		17	MR. WEINHARDT: Yes, I have an echo.
18		18	Are you hearing that?
19		19	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: We are
20		20	hearing an echo. That means someone will need to
21		21	mute.
22		22	MS. HONER: Mark, it actually looks
23		23	like you tried to call in, but we can also hear you on
24		24	your computer. So I think you can hang up on your
25		25	phone if you need to.
	Page 2		
1	APPEARANCES	1	Page 4  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung
1 2	APPEARANCES	1 2	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung
1 2 3	APPEARANCES	1 2 3	Page 4 MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.
2	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA	2	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?
2	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA	2	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it
2 3 4	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2 3 4	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.
2 3 4 5	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL	2 3 4 5	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.
2 3 4 5 6	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us	2 3 4 5 6	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.
2 3 4 5 6 7	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	APPEARANCES  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	APPEARANCES  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can. MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay. Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now? MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can. MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay. Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now? MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can. MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay. Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now? MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION: MARK WEINHARDT LSQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT LSW FIRM 2600 Grand Avenue Suite 450 Des Moines, Iowa 50312	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can. MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay. Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now? MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION: MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE Suite 450 Des Moines, Iowa 50312 email: mweinhardt@weinhardtlaw.com	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can. MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay. Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now? MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION: MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT ESQUIRE Suite 450 Des Moines, Iowa 50312 email: mweinhardt@weinhardtlaw.com	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can. MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay. Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now? MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine. While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you. MDE, please provide introductions.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JIL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION: MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM 2600 Grand Avenue Suite 450 Des Moines, lowa 50312 email: mweinhardt@weinhardtlaw.com  KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE STINSON LP 50 South Sixth Street Suite 2600	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.  While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL:     DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER     JILL BEMIS     KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL:     KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kathleen.reitz(@ag. state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:     KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kristine.nogosek(@ag.state.mn.us)  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION:     MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE     THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM     2600 Grand Avenue     Suite 450     Des Moines, lowa 50312     email: mweinhardt(@weinhardtlaw.com)     KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE     STINSON LP     50 South Sixth Street     Suite 2600     Minneapolis, MN 55402     kevin.conneely@stinson.com	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.  While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you.  MDE, please provide introductions.  MS. HERRERA: Good morning. Monica Herrera, director of Nutrition Program Services.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL:     DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER     JILL BEMIS     KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL:     KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kathleen.reitz(@ag. state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:     KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kristine.nogosek(@ag.state.mn.us)  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION:     MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE     THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM     2600 Grand Avenue     Suite 450     Des Moines, lowa 50312     email: mweinhardt(@weinhardtlaw.com)     KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE     STINSON LP     50 South Sixth Street     Suite 2600     Minneapolis, MN 55402     kevin.conneely@stinson.com	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.  While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you.  MDE, please provide introductions.  MS. HERRERA: Good morning. Monica Herrera, director of Nutrition Program Services.  Emily, why don't you go next.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL:     DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER     JILL BEMIS     KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL:     KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kathleen.reitz(@ag. state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:     KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kristine.nogosek(@ag.state.mn.us)  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION:     MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE     THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM     2600 Grand Avenue     Suite 450     Des Moines, lowa 50312     email: mweinhardt(@weinhardtlaw.com)     KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE     STINSON LP     50 South Sixth Street     Suite 2600     Minneapolis, MN 55402     kevin.conneely@stinson.com	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now? COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can. MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay. Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now? MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this. COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine. While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you. MDE, please provide introductions. MS. HERRERA: Good morning. Monica Herrera, director of Nutrition Program Services. Emily, why don't you go next. MS. HONER: Good morning, everyone.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL:     DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER     JILL BEMIS     KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL:     KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kathleen.reitz(@ag. state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:     KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL     OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL     900 Bremer Tower     445 Minnesota Street     St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127     email: kristine.nogosek(@ag.state.mn.us)  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION:     MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE     THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM     2600 Grand Avenue     Suite 450     Des Moines, lowa 50312     email: mweinhardt(@weinhardtlaw.com)     KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE     STINSON LP     50 South Sixth Street     Suite 2600     Minneapolis, MN 55402     kevin.conneely@stinson.com	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.  While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you.  MDE, please provide introductions.  MS. HERRERA: Good morning. Monica Herrera, director of Nutrition Program Services.  Emily, why don't you go next.  MS. HONER: Good morning, everyone.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JIL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION: MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM 2600 Grand Avenue Suite 450 Des Moines, lowa 50312 email: mweinhardt@weinhardtlaw.com  KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE STINSON LP 50 South Sixth Street Suite 2600	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. WEINHARDT: Okay. So I've hung up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.  While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you.  MDE, please provide introductions.  MS. HERRERA: Good morning. Monica Herrera, director of Nutrition Program Services.  Emily, why don't you go next.  MS. HONER: Good morning, everyone.  Emily Honer, manager of within the Nutrition Program Services division, and I will be speaking on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION: MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM 2600 Grand Avenue Suite 450 Des Moines, Iowa 50312 email: mweinhardt@weinhardtlaw.com KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE STINSON LP 50 South Sixth Street Suite 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402 kevin.conneely@stinson.com  ALSO PRESENT: Monica Herrera, MDH Director of Nutrition Programs Emily Honer, MDH Support Services Supervisor Jeanette Johnson-Reed, MDH Supervisor CACFP Eric S. Taubel, General Counsel Allison Loomis, MDE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.  While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you.  MDE, please provide introductions.  MS. HERRERA: Good morning. Monica Herrera, director of Nutrition Program Services.  Emily, why don't you go next.  MS. HONER: Good morning, everyone.  Emily Honer, manager of within the Nutrition Program Services division, and I will be speaking on behalf of the division for this appeal today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A P P E A R A N C E S  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION REVIEW PANEL: DR. STEPHANIE BURRAGE, DEPUTY COMMISSIONER JILL BEMIS KAREN CALCATERRA  COUNSEL FOR THE PANEL: KATHLEEN REITZ, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kathleen.reitz@ag.state.mn.us  MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK, ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL 900 Bremer Tower 445 Minnesota Street St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-2127 email: kristine.nogosek@ag.state.mn.us  PARTNERS IN NUTRITION: MARK WEINHARDT ESQUIRE THE WEINHARDT LAW FIRM 2600 Grand Avenue Suite 450 Des Moines, Iowa 50312 email: mweinhardt@weinhardtlaw.com KEVIN D. CONNEELY, ESQUIRE STINSON LP 50 South Sixth Street Suite 2600 Minneapolis, MN 55402 kevin.conneely@stinson.com  ALSO PRESENT: Monica Herrera, MDH Director of Nutrition Programs Emily Honer, MDH Support Services Supervisor Jeanette Johnson-Reed, MDH Supervisor CACFP Eric S. Taubel, General Counsel Allison Loomis, MDE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	up on my phone. Can you hear me now?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes, we can.  MR. WEINHARDT: Apologies. So it all works, okay.  Okay, now the problem is I can't hear you.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Can you hear us now?  MR. WEINHARDT: Okay, I can't hear you. Here's what I'm going to do is I'm going to call back in, but I'm going to mute my phone. So you'll hear me through the computer, but I'll hear you through the phone. Apologies for this.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: That's fine.  While you are figuring that out, we will start with introductions for MDE and then come back to you.  MDE, please provide introductions.  MS. HERRERA: Good morning. Monica Herrera, director of Nutrition Program Services.  Emily, why don't you go next.  MS. HONER: Good morning, everyone.  Emily Honer, manager of within the Nutrition Program Services division, and I will be speaking on

	Page 5	4	Page 7
1	Jeanette Johnson-Reed, a supervisor with the	1	Hinrichs, you should see my name on the screen.
2	Department of Education for Nutrition Services.	2	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.
3	MS. NOGOSEK: Good morning. This is	3	And I see you have a question, Emily.
4	Kristine Nogosek from the attorney general's office on	4	MS. HONER: Yes, this is really back
5	behalf of the division.	5	to the technical issue. Mark, I do see your phone,
6	MR. TAUBER: Good morning. I'm Eric	6	and I think just because of the hearing piece of it, I
7	Taubel, the general counsel for the Minnesota	7	think if you mute your Teams, the actual application
8	Department of Education.	8	on your screen, I think you should be able to
9	MR. WEINHARDT: This is Mark	9	primarily talk through your phone and that should
10	Weinhardt, and even though my phone is muted, I'm	10	solve it.
11	still getting the reverb.	11	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: All right.
12	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: We can't hear	12	We will get started.
13	it.	13	MS. CALCATERRA: Dr. Burrage, one
14	MR. WEINHARDT: You cannot?	14	thing before we get started is to mention the opening
15	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: We cannot.	15	statement regarding judicial notice. I don't know if
16		16	you wanted to have me say the statement.
	MR. WEINHARDT: All right. Well,	17	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Hold on one
17	I'll okay, this will work. So apologies everybody.		
18	This is Mark Weinhardt and with me is Kevin Conneely,	18	second. Will you read that for me, then, Karen?
19	our Minnesota counsel, as well as Robyn Tousignant,	19	Thank you.
20	who is the acting executive director of Partners in	20	MS. CALCATERRA: Sure. The Panel
21	Quality Care.	21	takes judicial notice that on September 20 , 2022, the
22	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.	22	U.S. Department of Justice announced that 47
23	Then next we will have the Panel members.	23	defendants have been indicted in connection with the
24	MS. CALCATERRA: Hi, I'm Karen	24	Feeding Our Future fraud scheme.
25	Calcaterra with MDE on the administrative panel.	25	To the extent that the recent indictment
	Page 6		Page 8
1	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the	1	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that
2	Page 6  MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the  Minnesota Department of Education on the	2	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and
	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the		may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.
2	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name	2	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and
2	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.	2	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.
2 3 4	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name	2 3 4	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.
2 3 4 5	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office.	2 3 4 5	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.
2 3 4 5 6	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.	2 3 4 5 6	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much,
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you	2 3 4 5 6 7	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much,  Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much,  Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing comments for both sets of opening statements for MDE	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much,  Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that decision has to be based on the information that was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing comments for both sets of opening statements for MDE and for Partners in Quality Care. You may begin.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that decision has to be based on the information that was before MDE on July 25 and not based on information
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing comments for both sets of opening statements for MDE and for Partners in Quality Care. You may begin.  MS. BEMIS: Dr. Burrage, may I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that decision has to be based on the information that was before MDE on July 25 and not based on information that came after that time.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing comments for both sets of opening statements for MDE and for Partners in Quality Care. You may begin.  MS. BEMIS: Dr. Burrage, may I interrupt a minute?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that decision has to be based on the information that was before MDE on July 25 and not based on information that came after that time.  And so we recognize the ability of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing comments for both sets of opening statements for MDE and for Partners in Quality Care. You may begin.  MS. BEMIS: Dr. Burrage, may I interrupt a minute?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much,  Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that decision has to be based on the information that was before MDE on July 25 and not based on information that came after that time.  And so we recognize the ability of the Panel to take judicial notice of certain things that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing comments for both sets of opening statements for MDE and for Partners in Quality Care. You may begin.  MS. BEMIS: Dr. Burrage, may I interrupt a minute?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes.  MS. BEMIS: Do we have the court	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much, Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that decision has to be based on the information that was before MDE on July 25 and not based on information that came after that time.  And so we recognize the ability of the Panel to take judicial notice of certain things that are properly considered and properly before it and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. BEMIS: I'm Jill Bemis with the Minnesota Department of Education on the administrative panel.  MS. REITZ: Good morning. My name is Kathleen Reitz from the attorney general's office. I represent the Panel today.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. If there is anyone else that I have missed through introductions? My name is Dr. Stephanie Burrage and I will be chairing the hearing today.  We will get started with opening statements. We will start with Partners in Nutrition, Partners in Quality Care, and you will have ten minutes for your opening statements. Once you get to the last minute, I will then come on the screen and I will put in the chat you have one minute left and then we will that will give you time for your closing comments for both sets of opening statements for MDE and for Partners in Quality Care. You may begin.  MS. BEMIS: Dr. Burrage, may I interrupt a minute?  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	may relate to the PIQC appeal in today's hearing that the parties wish the Panel to consider, both PIQC and MDE-NPS are allowed to address it at today's hearing.  COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.  We will begin.  MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you very much,  Dr. Burrage, and Panel members. Can everybody hear me okay now? Good.  I'd like to start with the judicial notice and the recent indictments. It is not the case that, in our view, the Panel can consider anything about the indictments in resolving the matter that is before the Panel today.  Today the matter before the Panel is whether, on July 25 of this year, MDE correctly denied claims for the month of November 2021 through May of 2022. And the correctness or incorrectness of that decision has to be based on the information that was before MDE on July 25 and not based on information that came after that time.  And so we recognize the ability of the Panel to take judicial notice of certain things that

existence after it took the July 25 action. The July 25 action has to be judged based on the record that exists when the action was taken.

In addition, I will say, although we believe the indictments are irrelevant to this particular appeal, that there are things about those indictments that should be placed in proper context. That is, number one, that the indictments do not allege any purposeful or knowing wrongdoing on the part of Partners in Quality Care in any way, shape or form.

To the degree that they say anything about Partners in Quality Care, which we will agree is Sponsor A in two of the indictments, what they indicate is that Sponsor A was itself defrauded, was itself lied to by certain sites or vendors. And that is a very different situation than what is alleged against Feeding Our Future, or any of the 47 individuals who have been indicted.

Moreover, the government has intensely and with great resources been investigating this matter for probably more than a year, but we know for at least the eight or nine months since January 20, and notwithstanding that intensive investigation for all of that period, when the indictments were unsealed, no

termination of Partners in Quality Care's contract that was handed down on May 27 of 2022. That action to terminate PIQC's contract was wrong and unsupported by the law and the facts for the reasons that we argued to this Panel just 10 days ago. This Panel should reverse the May 27 action.

If it does so, then it must also reverse these claim denials because, to the extent that claim denials are predicated on that May 27 action and that ground for the denials is gone, then the denials also should be reversed.

In addition, as the Panel probably knows, we are in federal court seeking a temporary restraining order to restrain MDE from giving any effect to the May 27 decision. If that temporary restraining order is granted, which should occur well before this Panel makes a decision in this appeal, then to the extent that these claim denials are based on the May 27 action, this action, the claim denials, must be reversed.

Even if the May 27 actions were valid, the May 27 action does not look backwards, it only looks forwards. What it did was terminate a contract as of May 27, which means that up until May 27, the contract was in effect. And so it is improper for the MDE

Page 10

one associated with Partners in Quality Care was indicted, nor was Partners in Quality Care itself indicted or accused of any kind of knowing wrongdoing.

And if the government, after this much time and this much investigation, has no such evidence, we think that is strong evidence to show that there simply is no wrongdoing of that sort on Partners in Quality Care's part.

Now, further on the question of judicial notice, this is the fifth appeal hearing that we have had regarding actions the MDE has taken against Partners in Quality Care. The prior four appeals are in many ways relevant or even control the outcome here. And in particular, two of those prior appeals have to do with the first round of claim denials for November and December of 2021 respectively.

We incorporate all of the arguments that were made in those appeals here and the Panel should take judicial notice of those records. It should take judicial notice, frankly, of all of the record in all of the four previous appeals and it particularly should take judicial notice of its own rulings because its own rulings, in part, control the outcome here.

Here's the first way that that's true. This denial of claims is based in large part on a

Page 12 division in charge to say that it can retroactively terminate a contract.

In other words, the contract did exist all the way up until May 27 and was a basis for properly submitting claims. The contract cannot be retroactively negated; it can't rewrite history.

A second way in which the past record is highly relevant to what occurs here is that this Panel issued a ruling on May 17 of 2022 that took away the very foundation of the other part of the claim denial. The claim denials are based in part on MDE's inspection of records that PIQC submitted for the justification of its claims.

Well, here's how the records came into MDE hands. On January 20, MDE issued a suspension of PIQC. On the strength of that suspension alone, MDE then on February 2 issued to PIQC a document called Meal Claim Instructions. That document for the first time ever required that PIQC submit documentation in support of every claim that it's made. The regulations do not require that. They only require that documents be maintained and that MDE can come and inspect them or retroactively request certain documents to be provided.

But the only reason that MDE -- that PIQC

was in the position of now having to submit documents to support every one of its claims was the February 2 Meal Claim Instructions. That document ceased to be in effect on May 17 of 2022 because this Panel reversed the January 20 suspension. When it reversed the suspension, the suspension went away. When the suspension went away, the basis for the February 22 Meal Claim Instructions went away.

And so the claim denials here that are based on the adequacy of the documents submitted in support must all be reversed because there is now no requirement that PIQC was ever supposed to submit those documents in the first place.

There is a related issue to this regarding the claim that no documents were uploaded to support the claims. Because the Meal Claim Instructions are now gone, there was no requirement to upload documents to support the claims. Even if there were such a requirement, MDE never communicated a deadline by which, under the Meal Claim Instructions, those documents were to be submitted.

In the appeal process, PIQC has submitted documents to support all of those claims and so the denial -- and there are 78 different claims denied this way -- should be reversed on that ground.

Page 15
legally that's what MDE is supposed to do. MDE cannot pick and choose within the sites in PIQC because the law is the same for everyone.

We incorporate all of our other written arguments there as though I made them today because 10 minutes is a fairly short period of time, but for all of those reasons, the claim denial should be reversed.

COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. Next we will have MDE.

MS. HONER: Thank you. Okay. So I'm going to start off here with our basics with our division, and then I'm going to get into correcting a lot of what we just heard.

So first, the Nutrition Program Services division -- I'm going to refer to it as the division here throughout the rest of this statement -- the division is housed within MDE and the department is the responsible state agency for administering any number of USDA child nutrition programs, but we're here today for CACFP, the Child and Adult Care Food Program, and we have the authority to administer this program under the corresponding federal program regulations of 7 CFR 226 and the federal regulations of 2 CFR 200.

So what I am going to be referencing today

Page 14

Additionally, MDE violated USDA regulations in these over 400 claim denials by failing to follow the portion requirements in the USDA regulations. 7 CFR 226.14(a) provides that MDE must disallow that portion of a claim that is improper, but must pay the rest of the claim that is proper. MDE never made any attempts to determine which portions of claims were bad and which portions of claims were compensable. One site, one month, all the meals, all the everything, it was either up or down.

But there are, indeed, compensable portions of all of these claims. MDE has never made a claim that zero food was provided, it has never made a claim that 100 percent of the money spent by the sites to prepare this food was fraudulent or wasted. MDE, thus, was required to decide which parts of these claims were compensable and which parts of these claims were not.

And, indeed, in its ruling in the November and December claim denials, this Appeal Panel said that it would be willing to have MDE work with the sites to try to apportion which parts of the claims were compensable and which parts of the claims were not.

In other words, this Panel recognized that

Page 16 can be found in the appeal file documentation that has been placed in the join t Sharepoint folder, and as we stated in the letter of action, the division has provided to Partners all of the documentation that the decision was based on at the time of action. The same information was copied from that folder to the appeal file folder for the Appeal Panel today.

Additionally, and we do agree that the indictments from this week and criminal information documents need to be considered, and so we've placed those in the appeal file this morning and we are asking that the Appeal Panel allow those to be brought into the record.

We also agree that Sponsor A is Partners in these indictments, and I'm going to get to correcting why Sponsor A is at fault here at some of those pieces in just a minute.

So it's important for the Appeal Panel to understand that many claims that Partners is appealing today were shown to have a vendor or operator that was charged this week for the scheme. And the fact that those claims have not been withdrawn is -- is absolutely just mind blowing that we're even here today for some of those claims.

The first correction I'm going to make is

that the action we are here for today is not based on the May 27, '22 decision to immediately terminate and withhold payment. The action we are here today is based on the regulatory requirements that Partners was required to do when submitting claims, the documentation that they were supposed to gather and review, and the monitoring of their sites before a claim was even submitted to the state agency.

So these indictments absolutely need to be considered again. And again we're going to go through some examples with that. But MDE is not allowed to make payments that are fraudulent, and the Panel must take notice of the indictments because, again, as I'm going to be going through today, specific sites from Partners made fraudulent claims and that is very telling that Partners has not withdrawn those claims today and that we are here and that Partners is fighting for those claims.

And not only that, but Partners is now saying, in fact, we didn't know they were fraudulent and so because of that we should get the payment because it wasn't uncovered until this week.

23 Absolutely not.

So getting to, again, getting to our action today, these claims were denied because MDE

Page 19 claims were directly connected to Think Tech Act and S&S Catering and those individuals were charged this week for fraud. Despite this, once again, Partners is still appealing the denial of those claims.

But moving on to January through May 2022, claims were denied for the additional reasons stated in the notice of action on July 25, 2022. Those issues were related to the documentation uploaded by Partners, such as the invoice or menu did not support the claim, another issue was that the site was found to have been delivering groceries, not unitized meals, and another claim denial category is that the months -- many occasions Partners didn't even attempt to upload the documentation for those claims.

So let's, again, talk about what did come up this week and how it relates, because it absolutely does. My first example of an issue I want you to look at is House of Refuge and the Loving Arms Adult Care. Loving Arms is owned by Hanna Marekegn and Hanna owns Brava Cafe, which supposedly -- well, Hanna also owns Brava Cafe. And Brava Cafe is the food vendor for House of Refuge. Hanna was charged this week and is expected to plead guilty to charges of fraud in the child nutrition program.

Another example is the January claims, if

Page 18

reviewed the claim documentation that Partners provided and we found that claims were not valid to be paid. They shouldn't have even been submitted to the state agency. We reviewed those claims for January through May and we clarified the denial decisions for November and December and we issued that decision on July 25, 2022. That's what we're here for today.

All right. So now I'm going to go into reviewing the action to deny those claims submitted by Partners. So for November and December, the MDE Appeal Panel remanded claims, certain claims, for November and December back to the division, and the claims that were remanded fell under the category of facts of the affidavits identified that the organization at the site was involved in the fraud and another reason was that claims were missing documents.

So in this action that we are here for today, those remanded claims for November and December were further clarified of what documentation was missing and what the direct relationship to the fraud investigation was.

I also want to point out -- that's very important to point out here for this week -- that seven of the claims that Partners is appealing today for December, five of them, five out of seven of those

Page 20

you look at sites understand MCS, or Multiple Community Services, PIN has these claims, PIN is still fighting for these claims today, and those Multiple Community Services sites were run by an individual named Anab Awad who was just charged this week because of running a fraud scheme through this very site that Partners is fighting for today. This site, Multiple Community Services, is listed in the indictment.

Another example if you look at February claims, Sharmarke Issa was also charged this week, operated the Minnesota Somali sites and is a brother of an employee of Partners. Partners didn't even provide documentation for this claim. They just submitted the claim on behalf of Sharmarke and they want the money.

The July 25 denial is based on the documentation Partners submitted to support their claims and MDE did have a right to require this documentation.

Whether there was instructions or not of how that documentation is submitted, MDE always has the right to request documentation when there is suspicion of fraud or that the claim is invalid. And, in fact, this is also included in the program agreement that Partners signed when they signed on for

these programs, that MDE can request documentation and Partners has to provide that in a reasonable time frame.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We requested this documentation because of the connections with the fraud investigation to Partners and their sites and we only continue to see those connections grow.

So after we provided those instructions to Partners, but really after we required the documentation, which we have the right to do, MDE then had a claim review team review the documentation and determine if the claim was supported by the documentation, as per the federal regulations of what is needed for a valid claim.

It was Partners' responsibility to ensure sites were eligible and true and it was Partners' responsibility to make sure that claims were valid before they were even submitted to the state agency and they failed.

The process of reviewing meal claim documentation should always start with the sponsor. The sponsor receives the meal plan documentation from 22 23 their site. Partners also monitors their sites. Partners reviews to ensure that those meals met all of 24 25 the requirements under 7 CFR 226, that the

of quote.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My question is what is PIQC's basis that any of the USDA memos and guidelines cited by PIQC has be absolved PIQC of the obligation to serve, quote/unquote, meals?

Page 23

MR. WEINHARDT: The thing that the USDA guidance did was very substantially loosen the requirements for how and when meals are to be served, and this particularly goes to the ingredients-not-meals basis that hundreds of claims were denied on.

Under the guidance that we described in our memorandum, you can't, in the COVID world, have children congregate multiple times a day for meals that are going to be served to them at a table. There had to be a different way to approach that in order to keep people safe.

The way that the USDA directed people to do it is to put things together in bulk to make it so that parents could go someplace, pick up the package, the package would have one week's worth of meals in it and that's how the meals would be delivered. And that might require some unpack aging or whatever on the part of parents, but the USDA condoned that because they wanted to figure out a way to still meet the pressing

Page 22

documentation is collected and retained for the recordkeeping requirements and that the claim can be substantiated before the claim is entered into the state agency system, and that is what we require Partners to provide.

MDE is correct in denving the meal claims because Partners failed to comply with the requirement of submitting and substantiating a valid claim. The division has included all of the regulatory citations in our summary to the Appeal Panel and we would refer back to that as they can be different for the different reasons of denial. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you very much. We will now move to the questions from the Panel.

16 MS. BEMIS: My questions are for 17

PIQC.

Counsel, I have a question based on your reference to Exhibit 11 of PIQC's submission. PIQC quoted in paragraph 10 of its September 13, 2022 appeal statement that, quote, state agencies and sponsoring organizations shall exercise discretion when meals fall short of meeting meal pattern requirements due to the COVID 19 related supply chain disruptions during the fiscal federal year 2022, end

Page 24 need without putting people at health risk.

And so that dramatically changed what is a meal for the purposes of how compliance with the program is gauged. And MDE did not in any way, shape or form take that into account or give us any analysis or justification for what it meant when it said ingredients, not meals. In fact, for the vast majority of those denials in that long chart in the July 25 letter, there is no notes, there's no explanation, there's no nothing.

MS. BEMIS: Does PIQC believe that the USDA memos and guidelines released PIQC from providing documentation required by 7 CFR Section 226.20 to support its claims?

MR. WEINHARDT: The USDA guidance does not change the recordkeeping requirements, but it also does change the way that one makes decisions when it reviews the records because it changes the permissible ways in which meals can be delivered.

MS. BEMIS: What is your basis from the federal regulations or any of the USDA memos or guidelines that you claim support this belief? Could you please provide the Panel with citations to specific pages of your claimed authority to that effect?

MR. WEINHARDT: So I believe that our memorandum discusses this for several pages, and I know the prior memoranda filed with this Panel did the same and then gave the web link to, I think, seven or eight different USDA publications and I think we

quoted specific language from those. And so I think our filing explain the point.

And the point is not that in our filing we need to explain each meal, each variation, each way in which the rules were loosened. Our point is that MDE is required to incorporate those changes in the rules in its analysis of what's an ingredient and what's a meal, and MDE didn't go that.

MS. BEMIS: And going back to the opening and the questions that we just were looking at, does PIQC have a response to examples cited by MDE-NPS specifically related to the claims Think Tech Act and S&S Catering that are implicated in both the earlier FBI affidavits and to the extent relevant to the latest federal indictment?

MR. WEINHARDT: I think, first of all, that what was stated in the federal indictments is dramatically different and more specific than what was provided in those earlier search warrant affidavits. We do not believe that the search warrant

Page 27 fully executed CACFP program agreement dated

November 6, 2015, and the federal regulations?

MR. WEINHARDT: What the contract

from 2015 and the federal regulations require is recordkeeping and a right to inspection of those records by MDE as it looks at claims, or even retroactively.

What those authorities do not do is require PIQC to affirmatively supply documents in support of every single claim for which it seeks reimbursement. That requirement was contained for the first time in the Meal Claim Instructions that were submitted to PIQC on February 2, and the basis for those Meal Claim Instructions was the January 20 suspension. This Panel has decided that the January 20 suspension was improper and it reversed it.

That took away any affirmative obligation on PIQC's part to submit documents in support of every single one of its claims.

MS. BEMIS: Counsel, PIQC has argued in multiple administrative appeals disputing evidentiary value of the FBI affidavits. In PIQC's appeal statement in this appeal, it argues in paragraph 71 that MDE-NPS has not identified or advanced actual evidence that demonstrates PIQC

Page 26

affidavits provided any level of specificity that would have required PIQC to withdraw any claims. I'll talk about this a little bit more in my closing statement, but it's not PIQC's intention to seek reimbursements and then turn around and pay money to sites where PIQC has a reasonable basis, which in some cases it now has only this week to believe that PIQC was itself the victim of fraud.

But all we're asking is that the denials be reversed so that we can go through this apportioning process that 226.14(a) requires, which is you decide what parts of the claims are compensable and what parts of the claims are not compensable. On July 25, PIQC had 100 percent of its claims denied without any apportionment analysis by an agency that did not have the indictments before it. It did not know any of those things.

MS. BEMIS: Counsel, paragraph 13 of PIQC's appeal statement that MDE-NPS imposed, quote, a list of increased documentation requirements, end of quote, upon PIQC, quote, without warning or proposed action on January 20, 2022, end of quote.

My question is, in PIQC's view, how do these so-called increased requirements differ from the documentary requirements already set forth in PIQC's Page 28

1 knowingly submitted a false or fraudulent claim. You
2 also previously requested permission to present live
3 witness testimony at an earlier hearing, which the
4 Panel had granted, but PIQC did not end up calling any
5 witnesses.

My question is: At today's hearing, does PIQC intend to introduce any witness's testimony or other types of evidence that PIQC considers to be, quote, actual evidence, unquote, that can contradict the FBI's affidavits?

MR. WEINHARDT: First of all, the FBI affidavits that were unsealed in January don't need to be contradicted because they don't contain substantial evidence that would support the claim of wrongdoing on the part of PIQC. There has never been any evidence of knowing misconduct on PIQC's part.

We're not calling a live witness today because the appeal procedures that MDE's Appeal Panel is using, which they're following apparently their rules, call for a one-hour hearing at which our ability to make a presentation is only a fraction of that. That simply does not give an opportunity for meaningful live testimony.

**MS. BEMIS:** Did PIQC submit any affidavits of its own or witnesses or any other type

of evidentiary documents that can contradict the FBI's affidavits? If so, please name the exhibits for the record.

MR. WEINHARDT: So they're in the Sharepoint folder and they were submitted as numbered exhibits in the previous claim denial appeals, but PIQC has submitted at least tens of thousands, if not now a six-digit number, of pages of documents that substantiate the claims for which it is seeking reimbursement, and they're divided up and organized site by site, month by month, et cetera, and so that, we think, is very significant evidence to demonstrate that some of the claims here are compensable, and in order for this Panel to reverse, it does not need to decide that 100 percent of the claims are compensable because what MDE did was deny 100 percent of them.

MS. BEMIS: Counsel, when PIQC submitted the November and December 2021 claims, did PIQC certify that the claims were correct and that the records are available to support the claims as required by 7 CFR 226.10(c)?

MR. WEINHARDT: I believe that the initial claim submissions for November and December

So my question is: Can PIQC please explain how these raw materials in bulk, boxes and bags not contradict Ms. Honer's technical assistance response dated as early as April 28, 2021?

MR. WEINHARDT: So what PIQC submitted in support of many of the claims are invoices or receipts that demonstrate food that was purchased, but then also menus to show what it was that was served. So the fact that the invoices include things that are ingredients doesn't mean that the ingredients were not, by the site, transformed into ready-to-eat meals.

The factual disconnect here is whether or not the actual product delivered to the client was a meal or whether it wasn't. The fact that a site purchased raw ingredients doesn't mean that the site didn't cook them. Additionally, the invoices show large quantities of things that are plainly ready to consume on the spot. Bananas, fluid milk, juices, you know, Graham crackers. All sorts of thing of that sort. And those things are plainly compliant.

And, again, we get into the question of how does MDE apportion those things that it thinks are compensable and those things that it thinks are not compensable because, A, they're not ready to eat and,

Page 30

complied with the Code of Federal Regulations, but that's been a number of months ago and gets into the appeal of those November and December claim denials, which we argued quite a long time ago so I'm going on memory here. I would need to go back and look at those initial submissions to tell you for sure.

MS. BEMIS: PIQC's Exhibit 9, MDE-NPS's 4/28/2021 response to PIQC's request for technical assistance states, to quote a few segments, program operators may provide bulk foods as long as individual meals and snacks are easily identifiable. Operators should ensure that only minimal preparation is required, food is not provided as ingredients for recipes, ready-to-eat cereal is not credible at lunch or supper.

The Panel notes many examples of items not ready to eat being in the supporting documentation. For example, in the January 2022 denied claim for site 9-18703, Action for East African People, the receipt shows spaghetti pasta in boxes, rice in 5-pound bags, Crystal sugar net weight 10 bounds, kidney beans in 16-ounce containers, potatoes in 5-pound bags. The receipt also shows ready-to-eat cereal such as Honey Bunches of Oats with different flavors. These are just a few examples out of the 16 pages of items.

Page 32

B, the site did not, in fact, cook them into a meal. And it's MDE's obligation under this regulation to figure out which parts are compensable and which parts are not. Again, all MDE did was, 100 percent of the time, deny all the claims.

MS. BEMIS: Related to the question, how can PIQC claim, quote, PIQC has complied with the directives from MDE since those changes to the CACFP went into effect, end of quote, in paragraph 9 of PIQC's appeal statement?

MR. WEINHARDT: Well, that's a relatively introductory and blanket statement early in the brief, but we make that statement because based upon the tens of thousands, at least, of documents that we have submitted, it shows that there is a good faith effort to comply with the regulations and that the regulations were, in fact, complied with. We believe that that's the case.

Now, are there gaps and do we now see some things in the indictments that give us pause for concern? Absolutely. But that's not a reason to deny 100 percent of the claims. That's a reason to figure out which ones are compensable and which ones are not.

**MS. BEMIS:** Does PIQC have anything in the appeals record to show that it deviated from

IN RE THE APPEAL HEARING OF PIN/PIQC Page 33 1 1 the meal pattern requirements in order to respond to 2 the food shortage, such as claimed in paragraph 10 of 2 3 3 PIQC's appeal statement? the MDE-NPS. 4 MR. WEINHARDT: I think that if we 4 5 5 went through all of the documentation submitted, there 6 would be evidence from which you could conclude that. 6 7 7 But that -- for me to point to that evidence on the 8 8 spot, I would need to review a lot of documents. 9 9 MS. BEMIS: Does PIQC have a that objection? 10 10 procedure in place to verify whether the board of 11 11 directors, officers, or employees are connected to any want to take this one? 12 of the sites in anything less than an arm's-length 12 13 relationship? 13 14 MR. WEINHARDT: So I would need to 14 15 look and see if there is a written procedure in place 15 16 16 for that. So I don't know the answer to that. And 17 that's not an issue that is in the July 25 claim 17 18 denial, it's not an issue that has been briefed, to my 18 19 knowledge, and so I don't want to get out over my skis 19 20 here in terms of what I know and what I don't. 20 MS. BEMIS: PIQC claims in paragraph 21 21 21 of the appeal statement that PIQC has an additional 22 22 39 claims that MDE-NPS neither paid nor addressed. 23 23 24 24 What months did these alleged 39 claims 25 fall in? 25 Page 34 1 MR. WEINHARDT: I know they're in 1 2 the January to May time frame. I can't apportion them 2 3 according to month. I mean we could, but, again, as I 3 4 4 sit here, I don't know where they fall. 5 5 MS. BEMIS: Paragraph 21 does not 6 6 contain a citation to the appeal record. In the 7 interest of administrative efficiency, could PIQC 7 8 8 please identify which exhibits in the appeal record 9 9 that relates directly to the 39 claims? license that food was being prepared on that site. 10 MR. WEINHARDT: So we can go back 10 11 11 and try to identify those and let you know what exhibits -- so let me make a note of that, paragraph 12 12 13 21. I think we can go back and tell you which ones 13 14 14 we're talking about.

MS. BEMIS: Have transactional

MR. WEINHARDT: I think the answer

MS. BEMIS: That is it for mine.

records with any of the companies listed as examples

in the two FBI affidavits, such as Empire Cuisine and

Markets and S&S Catering, been used to support any of

to that question is yes. Again, I'd need to look at

the documents, but it is the case that PIQC was doing

PIQC's January through May claims?

business with those two entities.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Karen?

Page 35 MS. CALCATERRA: Yeah, I will ask some additional questions. I will ask questions of

First, a couple of questions to follow-up on what has been stated. PIQC in its opening statement objected to the Panel taking judicial notice of the federal indictment that was announced on September 20, 2022. Does MDE-NPS have a response to

MS. HONER: Yes. Kristine, do you

MS. NOGOSEK: Certainly. The position of the division is that the Panel should and is entitled to, under the judicial notice rule, to go ahead and take notice of information in those indictments and criminal investigation complaint -- or criminal information complaints that bear on the validity of some of the claims that PIQC is seeking a denial of -- or I'm sorry that PIQC is seeking a reversal of the division's denial of the claims.

MS. CALCATERRA: Next, PIQC stated at the hearing that while the invoices showed certain bulk -- bulk raw materials, the submitted menus showed what was served. Invoices does not mean that what was actual product reflected in the invoices went to the

Page 36 recipients. What is MDE-NPS's response to that?

MS. HONER: Yeah, thank you for asking that question. So I want to address that by saying food production records are also part of the claim. And so the fact that food production records could not be provided does not tell us that food was actually produced on that site. I would also challenge Partners to even provide a food and beverage

Additionally, in prior appeals, prior documentation, Partners has challenged MDE in saying that dry goods should have been or could have been served and now they're changing their mind and saying, no, the food was dry goods and it was cooked. It wasn't cooked. And Partners' documentation supports that it wasn't cooked, that it was provided in those dry good bulk settings, that's what we reviewed, that's what our claim team reviewed.

The additional thing I want to correct here is that USDA did not change how documentation is reviewed. In fact, sponsors across the state were able to continue to support their claims, support their meals on reviews with the same type of documentation that we've always been looking at. Also, USDA has always said from the very

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

beginning that meals must be unitized. They have never once waived that requirement. MDE provided additional guidance on this throughout the COVID 19 pandemic and for the CACFP program year '22 guidance, that we released in bulletins, that we released to all sponsors operating CACFP in this program year, we specifically said the noncongregate waiver should not be used across the board, it should only be used as necessary for a COVID 19 outbreak, tat congregate settings were encouraged, schools were back in place, congregate settings were being used.

So there is no reason for that bulk meals to be delivered and we absolutely saw from the claim review of Partners' documentation that that -- that those dry goods were not cooked.

MS. CALCATERRA: One of MDE-NPS's duplicatively numbered attachment 3 is a 2016 criminal complaint against Sharon Ross and there is also a case search document regarding Ms. Ross.

Because MDE-NPS's appeal summary has not referenced Sharon Ross or these two documents, just so the record is clear, could MDE-NPS briefly state the specific relevance of these two documents to PIQC's appeal at hand?

MS. HONER: Yeah, absolutely. So

July 25 decision that we're here for today we're remanded from the Appeal Panel back to MDE for clarification. So we clarified those in the letter of action on July 25 so we didn't feel that the Excel spreadsheet was needed because the information that would have been in there was contained in the clarifications provided in the letter of action.

Page 39

Page 40

MS. CALCATERRA: MDE-NPS denied claims from November of 2021 through -- wait -- May 2022. MDE-NPS month/year folders do not include one for May 2022.

Was there a reason the May 2022 folder was not submitted to the appeal record?

MS. HONER: Yeah, great question. So that documentation that was provided was a copy of what Partners provided for MDE. So we took the documentation from Partner s' Sharepoint time that they had uploaded their claim documentation to, that's what we reviewed and that's what we put in the appeal file folder.

At the time of the -- actually, I shouldn't say that. At the time of the July 25 denial, there was no documentation for the May claim. So that's also where you'll see on the letter of action, Partners didn't even try to attempt to provide

Page 38

with that, when we were reviewing claims from Partners, House of Refuge does have claims additionally. House of Refuge was operating or claiming to operate at other churches that were not necessarily listed as House of Refuge for the sites that Partners claimed for.

It is important to note that Sharon Ross was not eligible to even participate in CACFP because of that conviction and so throughout the claim denial, we had referenced House of Refuge's claim denial, but we also wanted to support that there were additional reasons that those claims should not have been submitted and that House of Refuge should not have been allowed to operate in the way that they were operating.

MS. CALCATERRA: It appears that MDE-NPS denied claims from November 2021 through May 2022. In the MDE-NPS's Sharepoint folder only Excel sheets for claim summaries from January to May of 2022 were submitted to the appeal record.

Was there a reason no such sheets for the remanded November and December 2021 claims were submitted to the appeal record?

**MS. HONER:** Yeah, that is because November and December claims that were denied in this

documentation for certain claims.

MS. CALCATERRA: PIQC claims in paragraph 21 of its appeal statement that PIQC has an additional 39 claims that MDE-NPS neither paid nor addressed. Does MDE-NPS wish to respond to this contention?

**MS. HONER:** MDE-NPS will have to go back and review the claims that were submitted after the denial -- after the July 25 denial.

It is our position or understanding -- and Kristine, feel free to jump in if you want to correct me on this -- but the May 27 letter alone allows us to not pay claims we immediately terminated Partners. So any claims submitted after that, we had not reviewed.

Additionally, Partners continued to submit claims for June and possibly additional months after that, July and August, I'd have to look, but they had been terminated at that point.

MS. CALCATERRA: PIQC represents in paragraph 56 of its appeal statement, quote, PIQC provided MDE with invoices and menus that do support all 162, (162) of the claims, end of quote, that MDE-NPS denied for invoice and/or menus do not support the claim.

My question is, does MDE-NPS agree with

Page 41 Page 43 1 1 PIQC's representation? MS. BEMIS: Thank you. 2 MS. HONER: Absolutely not. The 2 **COMMISSIONER BURRAGE**: Are there any 3 other questions from the Panel? All right, thank you invoices only show that Partners failed to comply with 3 4 the federal program regulations. 4 very much. MS. CALCATERRA: Could MDE-NPS 5 5 We will now move into with the final 6 please provide one random example out of the 162 to 6 statements. We will start with MDE and you will have 7 7 show that PIQC's representation is incorrect? five minutes for your final statements. 8 MS. HONER: Thank you, Appeal Panel. 8 MS. HONER: Off the top of my head, 9 9 So what I want to close with, I'm glad that I was no, but we could definitely get that. 10 MS. CALCATERRA: Of the 14 claims 10 asked the question about the meals and how they were 11 MDE-NPS denied on the basis of, quote/unquote, missing 11 delivered here during COVID and during this review 12 some documents, was there any additional description 12 period of time. 13 other than some documents to put PIQC on notice as to 13 You know, as we look at dry ingredients what types of documents were missing, such as the one 14 14 and what was provided to children, the Appeal Panel is 15 presented as an example in MDE-NPS's appeal summary 15 exactly right in looking at how children need to eat 16 missing invoices? 16 ready-to-eat, unitized meals. And as you look at 17 **MS. HONER:** I believe that Partners 17 those invoices, that is just simply not the case. 18 could look at the claim summaries that were provided 18 And even for Partners to explain today 19 to them in the decision to see which claim documents 19 that, you know, they handed out fluid milk which could 20 were missing. I'd also like to go back, and I'm going 20 be drank easily at the site, if you look at those to try to find my summary here, but I do believe that 21 21 invoices, they were handing out gallons of milk. A examples of each denial reason were provided by the 22 22 gallon of milk is not realistic and it is not a 23 division in the summary, which is titled in the appeal 23 unitized meal. 24 24 file folder PIQC Denial of Claims November through Additionally, as we look at the 25 May, Summary and Timeline. There should be updated 25 documentation here today from the claims, Partners Page 44 Page 42 examples in there that I would refer the Appeal Panel believes that they followed the regulations, yet they 1 1 2 2 can't provide the documentation. They still are to look at. 3 MS. CALCATERRA: That concludes the 3 claiming that all of these claims are real by 4 questions that I have. I would ask other panel 4 appealing that all claims that were denied. They are 5 members if they have any additional questions for 5 still refusing to do the work of a sponsor that is 6 6 either party at this time? required when they signed that program agreement 7 MS. BEMIS: Yes, I have one. Could 7 agreeing to the regulations and so the compliance of a 8 I ask PIQC, since PIQC is supposed to already be 8 federal program. 9 9 vetting its claims before submission, how long does Partners is not reviewing their claims 10 PIQC need to get back to the panel regarding the 39 10 before submission. They are just letting those claims 11 claims? Would September 28, 2022 be a sufficient go through. They can't tell us that they have looked 11 12 time? 12 at every single claim and that they validated those 13 13 before they submitted them, and that we still found MR. WEINHARDT: That's five days, 14 and those are busy days for us because September --14 out this week a very high number of Partners claims 15 because next week we're going to be preparing for the 15 and sites were fraudulent. 16 temporary injunction hearing in federal court. I'd 16 It's just not possible that they were able 17 ask that we have until the end of the following week. 17 to do that work and that this still happened, and 18 So the end of the first week of October I'm sure we 18 we've got claims in pending status where the site 19 could get back to the Panel in time for that, and I 19 operator is being charged. 20 think that would still be well within the Panel's 20 PIN's argument today or Partners' argument 21 today is that they can submit anything and it is the 21 deadline for issuing its decision in this appeal. 22 MS. BEMIS: What is the date you're 22 state agency's job to sift through and to try to 23 proposing? 23 interpret. That is not the case. The burden of proof 24 MR. WEINHARDT: So it would be 24 is not on the state agency.

25

25

October 7.

PIN is the one who should be reviewing

those claims, who should be removing claims that are not valid, who should be training their sites, ensuring that those sites are true and accurate. And that's obviously not the case.

We cannot even believe that we are here today and Partners is continuing to fight for these fraudulent claims. We can't believe that nothing has been changed with those claims, that we are finding out more and more information in each of those affidavits and indictments and that we're still here.

Partners is so deep in this fraud scheme and it continues to push for the claims to be paid that we know were operated for the purpose of defrauding the government. They are on the record today fighting for that.

I'm going to give you a few more examples here. If you look at the indictment of Haji Salad, there are at least 12 sites under Partners which Haji was obtaining funds fraudulently from.

If you look at the indictment United States versus Fahad Harah (phonetic), 14 sites under Partners. The evidence is mounting.

There absolutely has been evidence of the wrongdoing on Partners' part, and that's the last piece that I want to correct here today before I

COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.

Next Mr. Weinhardt.

MR. WEINHARDT: Thank you. MDE does not say to this Panel that all of the claims -- or that it knows that all of the claims that PIQC submitted are improper, unsupported or anything of that sort.

There is no claim that no one was fed, there is no claim that all of the money was wasted or fraudulent. That is not MDE's position. Yet MDE's position is that it, nonetheless, is entitled to deny 100 percent of the claims because, well, it just doesn't want to pay any of them.

Now, we are not here to contend that MDE should pay Partners so that Partners should pay a site if the site was engaged in fraudulent activity. And we've only had these indictments for a very few days and it's not Partners' intention to try to continue to perpetrate on behalf of somebody who deceived Partners, but continue to perpetrate improper activity.

What needs to happen, according to the regulation that this Panel has recognized is applicable and that MDE has never responded to in any of its comments today, is to apportion what parts of

Page 46

leave, and that May affidavit absolutely proved that Partners had done wrongdoing, but Partners is not the victim of fraud. Partners was the route in which fraud occurred in the amount of \$179 million that was as according to the indictments.

As we all agree, Partners is Sponsor A. And to prove even further that Partners is not the victim of fraud, I would encourage the Appeal Panel to look at the United States versus Farah indictment, page 9, J.S., the initials J.S. That is Julius Scarver from Partners in Quality Care. If you look at page 14, it explains that Sponsor A, who is Partners, received bribes and kickbacks from employees and former employees. Partners is not the victim of fraud.

And even despite all of that mounting evidence that we are seeing over and over, Partners still was not able to provide the documentation, the regulatory required documentation, to support any of these claims.

I'm going to end with that in saying, again, we have reviewed the claim documentation, it is not correct. The July 25 letter of action to Partners is correct. And I think we can all agree that this decision needs to be affirmed. Thank you.

Page 48

these claims are compensable and what parts are not
 compensable. If some part of them is compensable, if
 some children were properly fed, then a 100 percent
 across the board claim denial is improper.
 And that's what this appeal is entirely

And that's what this appeal is entirely about, is whether or not MDE was within its legal rights to, on a blanket basis, deny every claim without looking at them, without thinking about them, but just to say Partners in Quality Care, you're shut out.

That was legal error. And if this Panel reverses that claim denial, that would then permit the parties to engage in a collaborative process, which unfortunately went out the window on January 20, but existed before that and existed well. It would allow the parties to engage in a collaborative process to try to get down to the truth of what happened, who got fed, who didn't get fed, what money was properly spent, what money was not properly spend.

Everyone in this hearing knows that there are honest, hard working, good faith people associated with many of these sites, trying their best on limited budgets to try to meet needs in the community and needs that were desperately pressing during the COVID pandemic. And it is amazingly hard hearted for MDE to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

try to say no to all of those people on the basis of the other bad apples that were in the bunch. And that's essentially what MDE is trying to do here.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With regard to the indictment as a basis to affirm the July 25 decision, look, the law is just the law and this is like first week or two of law school. This Panel is an appellate panel. This Panel reviews what is in the past. It reviews what has already been done and what has already happened.

And the thing that it is reviewing is a July 25 decision. Anything that happened after July 25 is a new set of facts that has nothing to do with whether the decision on July 25 was incorrect.

Now, reverse that decision and we can, in a collaborative way, take into account the new facts we know, then the indictments do become relevant and we can do something with them.

But the fact that the indictments exist now does not mean that they existed on July 25 and that they informed the decision that was made at that time.

MDE, frankly, is back on its heels about this whole situation, and we understand that, but that's not a reason to act with a chainsaw instead of a scalpel in terms of how these claims are going to be

Page 51 paragraph 56 of its appeal statement, quote, PIQC provided MDE with invoices and menus that do support all 162 of the claims, end of quote. MDE-NPS denied for invoice and/or menu do not support the claims.

Similar to the date requested by PIQC. we'll give MDE-NPS also until October 7 to get back to the Panel on that.

I'd like to thank everyone for coming --**MS. HONER:** Yeah, I'd like to just clarify with that, is Partners saying -- and did you say it was page 56 or item 56?

**COMMISSIONER BURRAGE:** I have representation in paragraph 56 of its appeal statement, quote.

MS. HONER: All right. So I'd like to ask the clarifying question with that. Is Partners providing us an example of where the documentation supports? Because, once again, it's not the state agency's responsibility for the burden of proof, it is the sponsors.

Or are they just simply having a blanket statement that their documents support it? Because our review team has obviously proved that that is not the case.

MR. WEINHARDT: So we made a

Page 50

adjudicated and who gets paid and who does not get paid. And it's also not a reason to misrepresent the records.

The very first justification in the July 25 letter -- and the bulk of the justification is the May 27 termination of PIQC's contract and yet MDE's representative in this proceeding says that that wasn't a justification at all.

Well, I would urge the Panel members to go back and read just the first few paragraphs of the July 25 letter. It's plain that the May 27 decision is the first justification for what happened here, which we think was improper.

Why would MDE misrepresent the record here? It simply does not make sense. They need to take credible and consistent positions. Our credible and consistent position is that a 100 percent claim denial is legally wrong and should be reversed so that we can go all do the work of figuring out who really should get paid.

**COMMISSIONER BURRAGE:** Thank you very much for your closing statement. I'd like to leave us today, MDE-NPS in answering a Panel question stated it would get back to the Panel regarding an example to contradict PIQC's representation in

Page 52

statement in the documents and the Panel has asked for 1 2 an example to contradict the statement. I think the

Panel is within its rights to ask for that and it's 3 4 not, I think, PIQC's obligation to prove each one of

5 450-some-odd claims are correct before the -- before 6 MDE is supposed to come up with one single example in 7 response to the Appeal Panel.

MS. HONER: Right. It was your responsibility --

**COMMISSIONER BURRAGE**: So let me say this -- thank you -- we will, because we do not want to have any discussion going back and forth between the two right now, what we'll do is we will make sure that we -- Kathleen, I see you present.

**MS. REITZ:** I heard the questions. This Panel -- I believe the Panel did not ask the additional information to reverse any sort of burden of proof in this case.

That was, basically, a question to verify the accuracy of a statement provided in the brief of PIQC because PIQC made a blanket statement standing by the accuracy of everything it submitted. So just to assist the Panel in understanding the representations of the PIQC's statements in the interests of administrative efficiency, that the Panel is asking a

	Page 52		Paga 55
1	simple clarification question.	1	Page 55 (Proceedings concluded at 11:15 a.m.)
2	So, Emily, I don't believe the Panel is	2	(i roossamge somelaasa at riiro alliii)
3	asking MDE to prove what is supposed to be prove n by	3	
4	PIQC.	4	
5	MS. BEMIS: What we were requesting	5	
6	is that you would provide one random example out of	6	
7	the 162 to show that PIQC's representation is	7	
8	incorrect because when we asked the question, you said	8	
9	you would have to go look and we just want one	9	
10	example.	10	
11	MS. HONER: So, Kristine, are you	11	
12	understanding what's needed and we can debrief after?	12	
13	MS. NOGOSEK: Let me just ask it	13	
14	this way: Could someone on the Panel or Kathleen	14	
15	simply restate what it is that you're asking the	15	
16	division for and we will get that to you, just so we	16	
17	are everyone is clear.	17	
18	MS. BEMIS: Okay.	18	
19	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Go ahead,	19	
20	Kathleen. Let Kathleen provide it.	20	
21	MS. REITZ: Sure. I believe the	21	
22	question where Ms. Bemis was asking at the time where	22	
23	Ms. Honer responded with she would like to go back and	23	
24	look and get back to the Panel was a question along	24	
25	the line of PIQC made a representation in paragraph 56	25	
20	and mile of the community of the communi	20	
1	Page 54 of the appeal statement, quote, PIQC provided MDE with	1	Page 56 STATE OF MINNESOTA)
2	invoices and menus that do support all 162 of the	2	COUNTY OF WRIGHT )
3	claims, end of quote, that the MDE-NPS has denied for	3	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
4	invoice and/or menu do not support the claims.	4	KEI OKTEKO GEKTII IOATE
5	And Ms. Bemis asked, does MDE-NPS agree	5	
6	with PIQC's representation, and if my notes are right,	6	I, Gail M. Hinrichs, do hereby certify that
7	Ms. Honer didn't agree, which was why Ms. Bemis asked	7	the above and foregoing transcript, consisting of the
8	since you didn't agree, could MDE-NPS please provide	8	preceding 55 pages is a correct transcript of my
9	one random example to show that PIQC's representation	9	stenograph notes, and is a full, true and complete
10	is incorrect.	10	transcript of the proceedings to the best of my
11	It was really a clarification of whether	11	ability.
12	any representation was inaccurate; it wasn't to	12	Dated September 24, 2022
13	reverse any burden of proof.	13	Dated September 21, 2022
14	MS. NOGOSEK: Understood. Thank you	14	
15	for that clarification.	15	/s/ Gail M. Hinrichs, RPR
16	MS. CALCATERRA: I want to clarify	16	/s/ Gail M. Hinrichs, RPR Gail M. Hinrichs Registered Professional Reporter
17	that it was myself, Karen Calcaterra, that asked that	17	, togistoreal i ronoccional i toponto.
18	question originally.	18	
19	MS. REITZ: I'm so sorry, I didn't	19	
20	take down in my notes who said what . So my apologies .	20	
21	COMMISSIONER BURRAGE: Thank you.	21	
22	Okay, so that has we have answered that question.	22	
23	I would like to thank everyone for participa ting today	23	
24	and we will wait for the information and follow-up in	24	
25	print. Everyone have a wonderful day.	25	

	10:00 a.m [1] 3/2	<b>450 [1]</b> 2/14	actually [3] 3/22 36/7	14/9 14/12 15/4 15/6
COMMISSIONER	<b>11 [1]</b> 22/19	450-some-odd [1] 52/5	39/21	16/4 18/8 21/24 22/9
	<b>11:15 a.m [1]</b> 55/1	<b>47 [2]</b> 7/22 9/18	addition [2] 9/4 11/12	25/22 26/9 28/11 31/20
BURRAGE: [23] 2/23	<b>12 [1]</b> 45/18		additional [11] 19/6	32/4 32/5 33/5 37/5
3/18 4/2 4/6 4/13 5/11	<b>13 [2]</b> 22/20 26/18	5	33/22 35/2 36/19 37/3	40/22 43/3 44/3 44/4
5/14 5/21 6/6 6/21 7/1	<b>14 [3]</b> 41/10 45/21	<b>5-pound [2]</b> 30/20	38/11 40/4 40/16 41/12	46/6 46/16 46/24 47/4
7/10 7/16 8/3 15/7	46/12	30/22	42/5 52/17	47/5 47/9 49/1 50/8
22/12 43/1 46/25 50/20	<b>16 [1]</b> 30/25	<b>50 [1]</b> 2/17	additionally [7] 14/1	50/19 51/3 51/15 54/2
51/11 52/9 53/18 54/20	16-ounce [1] 30/22	<b>50312 [1]</b> 2/15	16/8 31/17 36/10 38/3	allege [1] 9/9
COURT REPORTER:	<b>162 [6]</b> 40/22 40/22	<b>55 [1]</b> 56/8	40/15 43/24	alleged [2] 9/17 33/24
[1] 6/24	41/6 51/3 53/7 54/2	<b>55101-2127 [2]</b> 2/7	address [2] 8/3 36/3	Allison [1] 2/22
MR. TAUBER: [1] 5/5	<b>17 [2]</b> 12/9 13/4	2/11	addressed [2] 33/23	allow [2] 16/12 48/15
MR. WEINHARDT: [27]	<b>18703 [1]</b> 30/19	<b>55402 [1]</b> 2/18	40/5	allowed [3] 8/3 17/11
3/16 3/25 4/3 4/8 5/8	<b>19 [3]</b> 22/24 37/3 37/9	<b>56 [6]</b> 40/20 51/1 51/11	adequacy [1] 13/10	38/14
5/13 5/15 8/5 23/5	<del></del>	51/11 51/13 53/25	adjudicated [1] 50/1	allows [1] 40/12
24/14 24/25 25/20 27/2	2		administer [1] 15/21	alone [2] 12/16 40/12
28/10 29/3 29/23 31/4	<b>20 [9]</b> 7/21 9/23 12/15	7	administering [1]	along [1] 53/24
32/10 33/3 33/13 33/25	13/5 26/22 27/14 27/16	<b>71 [1]</b> 27/24	15/18	already [4] 26/25 42/8
34/9 34/19 42/12 42/23	35/8 48/14	<b>78 [1]</b> 13/24	administrative [5] 5/25	49/9 49/9
47/2 51/24	<b>200</b> [1] 15/24	<del></del>	6/3 27/21 34/7 52/25	also [23] 2/20 3/23
<b>MS. BEMIS: [24]</b> 5/25	<b>2015 [2]</b> 27/2 27/4	9	Adult [2] 15/20 19/18	11/7 11/10 16/14 18/22
6/19 6/22 22/15 24/10	<b>2016 [1]</b> 37/17	<b>9-18703 [1]</b> 30/19	advanced [1] 27/25	19/20 20/10 20/24
24/19 25/13 26/17	<b>2021 [8]</b> 8/16 10/16	<b>900 [2]</b> 2/6 2/10	affidavit [1] 46/1	21/23 24/17 28/2 30/23
27/19 28/23 29/18 30/6	29/20 30/8 31/4 38/17		affidavits [11] 18/14	
32/5 32/23 33/8 33/20	38/22 39/9	<b>A</b>	25/19 25/25 26/1 27/22	31/8 36/4 36/7 36/25 37/18 38/11 39/24
34/4 34/14 34/23 42/6	<b>2022 [21]</b> 1/15 7/21	a.m [3] 1/15 3/2 55/1	28/10 28/12 28/25 29/2	
42/21 42/25 53/4 53/17	8/17 11/2 12/9 13/4	ability [3] 8/21 28/21	34/17 45/10	41/20 50/2 51/6
MS. CALCATERRA:	18/7 19/5 19/7 22/20	56/11		although [1] 9/4
<b>[14]</b> 5/23 7/12 7/19	22/25 26/22 30/18 35/8	able [4] 7/8 36/22	affirm [1] 49/5	always [4] 20/21 21/21
34/25 35/20 37/15	38/18 38/19 39/10	44/16 46/18	affirmative [1] 27/17	36/24 36/25
38/15 39/7 40/1 40/18	39/11 39/12 42/11	about [11] 8/11 8/24	affirmatively [1] 27/9	am [1] 15/25
41/4 41/9 42/2 54/15	56/12	9/6 9/12 19/15 26/3	affirmed [1] 46/25	amazingly [1] 48/25
MS. HERRERA: [1]	<b>21 [4]</b> 33/22 34/5 34/13	34/14 43/10 48/6 48/8	African [1] 30/19	amount [1] 46/4
4/17	40/3	49/22		Anab [1] 20/5
MS. HONER: [18] 3/21	<b>2127 [2]</b> 2/7 2/11	above [2] 1/10 56/7	21/8 21/9 40/8 40/9 40/14 40/16 49/11	<b>analysis [3]</b> 24/5 25/12 26/15
4/20 7/3 15/9 35/9 36/1	<b>22 [1]</b> 13/7	above-entitled [1] 1/10	53/12	
37/24 38/23 39/13 40/6	<b>226 [2]</b> 15/23 21/25	absolutely [10] 16/23		and/or [3] 40/23 51/4 54/4
41/1 41/7 41/16 43/7	<b>226.10 [1]</b> 29/23	17/9 17/23 19/16 32/21	ag.state.mn.us [2] 2/7	
51/8 51/14 52/7 53/10	<b>226.14 [2]</b> 14/4 26/11	37/13 37/25 41/2 45/23	2/11	announced [2] 7/22
MS. JOHNSON-REED:	<b>226.20 [1]</b> 24/14	46/1	again [12] 17/10 17/10	35/7
<b>[1]</b> 4/24	23rd [1] 1/14	absolved [1] 23/4		another [5] 18/16
MS. NOGOSEK: [4]	<b>24 [1]</b> 56/12	according [3] 34/3	31/22 32/4 34/3 34/21	19/10 19/12 19/25 20/9
5/2 35/11 53/12 54/13	<b>25 [22]</b> 8/15 8/19 9/1	46/5 47/22	46/22 51/18	answer [2] 33/16 34/20
MS. REITZ: [4] 6/3	9/2 18/7 19/7 20/16	account [2] 24/5 49/15	<b>against [3]</b> 9/18 10/11 37/18	answered [1] 54/22
52/14 53/20 54/18	24/9 26/14 33/17 39/1	accuracy [2] 52/20		answering [1] 50/23
<u> </u>	39/4 39/22 40/9 46/23	52/22	agencies [1] 22/21 agency [7] 15/18 17/8	<b>any [36]</b> 9/9 9/10 9/18 10/3 11/14 14/7 15/18
<u>\$</u>	49/5 49/11 49/12 49/13	accurate [1] 45/3	18/4 21/18 22/4 26/15	23/3 24/4 24/5 24/21
<b>\$179 [1]</b> 46/4	49/19 50/5 50/11	accused [1] 10/3	44/24	26/1 26/2 26/15 26/17
\$179 million [1] 46/4	<b>2600 [2]</b> 2/14 2/18	across [3] 36/21 37/8	agency's [2] 44/22	27/17 28/4 28/7 28/16
	<b>27 [14]</b> 11/2 11/6 11/9	48/4	51/19	28/24 28/25 29/16
	11/15 11/19 11/21	act [3] 19/1 25/18		
<b>'22 [2]</b> 17/2 37/4	11/22 11/24 11/24 12/4	49/24	agenda [2] 3/5 3/6	33/11 34/16 34/18 40/14 41/12 42/5 43/2
1	17/2 40/12 50/6 50/11	acting [1] 5/20	ago [3] 11/5 30/2 30/4 agree [9] 9/13 16/8	46/19 47/13 47/24
	<b>28 [2]</b> 31/4 42/11	action [23] 9/1 9/2 9/3		
/s [1] 56/15	<del></del>	11/2 11/6 11/9 11/19	16/14 40/25 46/6 46/24 54/5 54/7 54/8	52/12 52/17 54/12 54/13
1	3	11/19 11/22 16/3 16/5		
<u></u>	<b>39 [5]</b> 33/23 33/24 34/9	I	agreeing [1] 44/7	anyone [1] 6/8
<b>10 [5]</b> 11/5 15/5 22/20	40/4 42/10	18/17 19/7 26/22 30/19	agreement [3] 20/25	anything [7] 8/11 9/12
30/21 33/2		39/4 39/7 39/25 46/23	27/1 44/6	32/24 33/12 44/21 47/6
100 percent [9] 14/14	4	actions [2] 10/11 11/21	ahead [2] 35/15 53/19	49/11
26/14 29/15 29/17 32/4	<b>4/28/2021 [1]</b> 30/8	activity [2] 47/16 47/21	<b>all [43]</b> 4/5 5/16 7/11	apologies [4] 4/4 4/13
32/22 47/12 48/3 50/17	<b>400 [1]</b> 14/2	actual [5] 7/7 27/25	9/24 10/17 10/20 10/20	5/17 54/20
<b>10:00 [1]</b> 1/15	<b>445 [2]</b> 2/6 2/10	28/9 31/14 35/25	12/3 13/11 13/23 14/9	apparently [1] 28/19
		= 5.5 5 1 1 55.25		

A	36/3 52/25 53/3 53/15	34/18 35/5 36/12 36/12	Cafe [3] 19/20 19/21	chat [1] 6/16
appeal [50] 1/6 1/11	53/22	36/24 38/12 38/14 39/6	19/21	child [3] 15/19 15/20
4/24 8/1 9/6 10/10	assist [1] 52/23	40/18 45/8 45/23 49/9	CALCATERRA [3] 2/3	19/24
11/17 13/22 14/20 16/1	assistance [2] 30/9	before [19] 1/11 1/13	5/25 54/17	children [4] 23/14
16/6 16/7 16/11 16/12	31/3	7/14 8/12 8/14 8/19	call [3] 3/23 4/10 28/20	43/14 43/15 48/3
16/18 18/11 22/10	ASSISTANT [2] 2/5 2/9	8/23 11/17 17/7 21/18 22/3 26/16 42/9 44/10	called [2] 12/17 26/24	choose [1] 15/2 churches [1] 38/4
22/21 26/19 27/23	associated [2] 10/1   48/21	44/13 45/25 48/15 52/5	calling [2] 28/4 28/17 came [4] 1/10 8/20	citation [1] 34/6
27/23 28/18 28/18 30/3	attachment [1] 37/17	52/5	8/25 12/14	citations [2] 22/9 24/23
32/10 33/3 33/22 34/6	attempt [2] 19/13	begin [3] 3/15 6/19 8/5	can [28] 3/11 3/23 3/24	cited [2] 23/3 25/16
34/8 37/20 37/24 38/20	39/25	beginning [1] 37/1	4/2 4/3 4/7 8/7 8/11	claim [67]
38/23 39/2 39/13 39/19 40/3 40/20 41/15 41/23	attempts [1] 14/7	behalf [4] 4/24 5/5	12/1 12/22 16/1 21/1	claimed [3] 24/24 33/2
42/1 42/21 43/8 43/14	attorney [6] 2/5 2/5 2/9	20/14 47/19	22/2 22/11 24/19 26/10	38/6
46/8 48/5 51/1 51/13	2/9 5/4 6/5	being [4] 30/17 36/9	28/9 29/1 31/1 32/7	claiming [2] 38/4 44/3
52/7 54/1	August [1] 40/17	37/11 44/19	34/10 34/13 44/21	claims [113]
appealing [4] 16/19	authorities [1] 27/8	belief [1] 24/22	46/24 49/14 49/17	clarification [4] 39/3
18/24 19/4 44/4	authority [2] 15/21	believe [14] 9/5 24/11	50/19 53/12	53/1 54/11 54/15
appeals [8] 10/12	24/24 available [1] 29/22	25/1 25/25 26/7 29/24 32/18 41/17 41/21 45/5	can't [9] 4/6 4/9 5/12 12/6 23/13 34/2 44/2	clarifications [1] 39/7 clarified [3] 18/5 18/19
10/14 10/18 10/21	Avenue [1] 2/14	45/7 52/16 53/2 53/21	44/11 45/7	39/3
27/21 29/6 32/25 36/10	Awad [1] 20/5	believes [1] 44/1	cannot [5] 5/14 5/15	clarify [2] 51/10 54/16
appears [1] 38/16	away [5] 12/9 13/6	BEMIS [5] 2/3 6/1	12/5 15/1 45/5	clarifying [1] 51/16
appellate [1] 49/7	13/7 13/8 27/17	53/22 54/5 54/7	Care [14] 1/7 3/3 5/21	clear [2] 37/22 53/17
apples [1] 49/2		<b>Bemis asked [1]</b> 54/7	6/13 6/19 9/10 9/13	client [1] 31/14
applicable [1] 47/24 application [1] 7/7	<u>B</u>	best [2] 48/22 56/10	10/1 10/2 10/12 15/20	close [1] 43/9
apportion [4] 14/22	back [22] 4/11 4/16 7/4		19/18 46/11 48/9	closing [3] 6/17 26/3
31/23 34/2 47/25		beverage [1] 36/8	Care's [2] 10/8 11/1	50/22
apportioning [1] 26/11		bit [1] 26/3	case [9] 8/10 32/18	Code [1] 30/1
apportionment [1]		blanket [4] 32/12 48/7	34/22 37/18 43/17	collaborative [3] 48/13
26/15	49/22 50/10 50/24 51/6 52/12 53/23 53/24	51/21 52/21	44/23 45/4 51/24 52/18	48/16 49/15
approach [1] 23/16	backwarde [4] 11/22	<b>blowing [1]</b> 16/23 <b>board [3]</b> 33/10 37/8	cases [1] 26/7 category [2] 18/13	collected [1] 22/1 come [5] 4/16 6/15
approximately [1] 1/15	bad [2] 14/8 49/2	48/4	19/12	12/22 19/15 52/6
April [1] 31/4	bags [3] 30/20 30/22	both [3] 6/18 8/2 25/18	Catering [3] 19/2 25/18	
April 28 [1] 31/4	31/3	bounds [1] 30/21	34/18	commencing [1] 1/15
are [72]	Bananas [1] 31/19	boxes [2] 30/20 31/2	ceased [1] 13/3	comments [2] 6/18
argued [3] 11/5 27/20 30/4	based [13] 8/18 8/19	Brava [3] 19/20 19/21	cereal [2] 30/14 30/23	47/25
argues [1] 27/23	9/2 10/25 11/18 12/11	19/21	certain [6] 8/22 9/16	COMMISSIONER [1]
argument [2] 44/20	13/10 16/5 17/1 17/4	Bremer [2] 2/6 2/10	12/23 18/11 35/22 40/1	2/2
44/20	20/16 22/18 32/13	bribes [1] 46/13	Certainly [1] 35/12	communicated [1]
arguments [2] 10/17	basically [1] 52/19	brief [2] 32/13 52/20	<b>CERTIFICATE</b> [1] 56/3	13/19
15/5	basics [1] 15/11 basis [11] 12/4 13/7	briefed [1] 33/18	certify [2] 29/21 56/6	community [4] 20/2
arm's [1] 33/12	23/2 23/10 24/20 26/6	briefly [1] 37/22 brother [1] 20/11	cetera [1] 29/11 CFR [6] 14/4 15/23	20/4 20/8 48/23 companies [1] 34/16
arm's-length [1] 33/12	27/13 41/11 48/7 49/1	brought [1] 16/12	15/24 21/25 24/13	compensable [16]
Arms [2] 19/18 19/19	49/4	budgets [1] 48/23	29/23	14/9 14/11 14/17 14/23
around [1] 26/5	be [57]	bulk [8] 23/19 30/10	chain [1] 22/24	26/12 26/13 29/13
<b>as [35]</b> 5/19 5/19 11/12 11/23 15/5 15/15 16/2	beans [1] 30/21	31/2 35/23 35/23 36/17	chainsaw [1] 49/24	29/15 29/17 31/24
17/13 19/9 21/13 22/11	bear [1] 35/17	37/12 50/5	chairing [1] 6/10	31/25 32/3 32/23 48/1
27/6 29/5 29/22 30/10	because [35] 7/6 10/22	<b>bulletins</b> [1] 37/5	challenge [1] 36/8	48/2 48/2
30/10 30/13 30/23 31/4	11/8 13/4 13/11 13/16	bunch [1] 49/2	challenged [1] 36/11	complaint [2] 35/16
31/4 33/2 34/3 34/16	13/2 13/3 17/13 17/21	Bunches [1] 30/24	change [3] 24/16 24/17	37/18
34/17 37/8 38/5 41/13	17/22 17/25 19/16 20/5	burden [4] 44/23 51/19		complaints [1] 35/17
41/14 41/15 43/13	21/4 22/7 23/24 24/18 28/13 28/18 29/17	52/17 54/13	changed [2] 24/2 45/8	complete [1] 56/9
43/16 43/24 46/5 46/6	31/25 32/13 37/20 38/8	<b>BURRAGE [5]</b> 2/2 6/10 6/20 7/13 8/7	25/11 32/8	compliance [2] 24/3
49/4	38/24 39/5 42/14 42/15	business [1] 34/23	changing [1] 36/13	compliant [1] 31/21
ask [11] 3/9 3/12 35/1	47/12 51/18 51/22	busy [1] 42/14	charge [1] 12/1	complied [3] 30/1 32/7
35/2 42/4 42/8 42/17	52/11 52/21 53/8		charged [6] 16/21 19/2	32/17
51/16 52/3 52/16 53/13	become [1] 49/16	C	19/22 20/5 20/10 44/19	comply [3] 22/7 32/16
<b>asked [6]</b> 43/10 52/1 53/8 54/5 54/7 54/17	been [22] 7/23 9/19	<b>CACFP [7]</b> 2/21 15/20	charges [1] 19/23	41/3
asking [7] 16/12 26/9	9/21 16/2 16/22 18/3	27/1 32/8 37/4 37/6	chart [1] 24/8	computer [2] 3/24 4/12
	19/11 28/15 30/2 33/18	38/8		
	İ	i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	i	İ

C	41/18 42/7 42/19 43/19	13/24 15/7 18/5 19/4	15/15 15/17 16/3 18/12	
concern [1] 32/21	53/14 54/8	19/12 20/16 22/12 29/6	22/9 35/13 41/23 53/16	during [4] 22/25 43/11
conclude [1] 33/6	<b>counsel [8]</b> 2/4 2/22 5/7 5/19 22/18 26/18	33/18 35/19 35/20 38/9 38/10 39/23 40/9 40/9	division's [1] 35/20 do [36] 3/7 4/10 6/23	43/11 48/24
concluded [1] 55/1	27/20 29/19	41/22 41/24 48/4 48/12	7/5 9/8 10/15 12/21	E
concludes [1] 42/3	COUNTY [1] 56/2	50/18	15/1 16/8 17/5 21/10	each [6] 25/9 25/9 25/9
condoned [1] 23/24	couple [1] 35/4	denials [14] 10/15 11/8		41/22 45/9 52/4
congregate [3] 23/14	court [3] 6/23 11/13	11/9 11/10 11/10 11/18	27/8 32/19 35/10 39/10	earlier [3] 25/19 25/24
37/9 37/11	42/16	11/19 12/11 13/9 14/2	40/21 40/23 41/21 44/5	28/3
connected [2] 19/1	<b>COVID [6]</b> 22/24 23/13	14/20 24/8 26/9 30/3	44/17 49/3 49/12 49/16	early [2] 31/4 32/12
33/11	37/3 37/9 43/11 48/24	denied [15] 8/15 13/24	49/17 50/19 51/2 51/4	easily [2] 30/11 43/20
connection [1] 7/23 connections [2] 21/5	crackers [1] 31/20	17/25 19/6 23/11 26/14	52/11 52/13 54/2 54/4	East [1] 30/19
21/7	credible [3] 30/14	30/18 38/17 38/25 39/8	56/6	eat [7] 30/14 30/17
<b>CONNEELY [2]</b> 2/16	50/16 50/16	40/23 41/11 44/4 51/3	document [4] 12/17	30/23 31/12 31/25
5/18	criminal [4] 16/9 35/16		12/18 13/3 37/19	43/15 43/16
consider [3] 8/2 8/11	35/17 37/17	deny [6] 18/9 29/17	documentary [1] 26/25	echo [2] 3/17 3/20
8/25	Crystal [1] 30/21	32/5 32/21 47/11 48/7	documentation [41]	<b>EDUCATION [7]</b> 1/2 1/12 2/2 2/8 5/2 5/8 6/2
considered [3] 8/23	Cuisine [1] 34/17	denying [1] 22/6	12/19 16/1 16/4 17/6	effect [5] 11/15 11/25
16/10 17/10	D	department [9] 1/2 1/11 2/2 2/8 5/2 5/8 6/2	18/1 18/19 19/8 19/14 20/13 20/17 20/19	13/4 24/25 32/9
considers [1] 28/8	d/b/a [1] 1/7	7/22 15/17	20/13/20/17/20/19	efficiency [2] 34/7
consistent [2] 50/16	date [2] 42/22 51/5	DEPUTY [1] 2/2	21/10 21/11 21/13	52/25
50/17	dated [3] 27/1 31/4	Des [1] 2/15	21/21 21/22 22/1 24/13	effort [1] 32/16
consisting [1] 56/7	56/12	described [1] 23/12	26/20 30/17 33/5 36/11	eight [2] 9/23 25/5
consume [1] 31/19	day [3] 1/14 23/14	description [1] 41/12	36/15 36/20 36/24	either [2] 14/10 42/6
contain [2] 28/13 34/6	54/25	desperately [1] 48/24	37/14 39/15 39/17	eligible [2] 21/16 38/8
<b>contained [2]</b> 27/11 39/6	days [4] 11/5 42/13	despite [2] 19/3 46/16	39/18 39/23 40/1 43/25	else [1] 6/8
containers [1] 30/22	42/14 47/17	determine [2] 14/7	44/2 46/18 46/19 46/22	email [3] 2/7 2/11 2/15
contend [1] 47/14	deadline [2] 13/19	21/12	51/17	Emily [5] 2/21 4/20
contention [1] 40/6	42/21	deviated [1] 32/25	documents [26] 12/22	4/22 7/3 53/2
context [1] 9/7	debrief [1] 53/12	did [20] 11/23 12/3	12/24 13/1 13/10 13/13	Empire [1] 34/17
continue [4] 21/6	deceived [1] 47/19	19/9 19/15 20/18 23/7	13/15 13/17 13/21	employee [1] 20/12
36/22 47/18 47/20	<b>December [12]</b> 10/16 14/20 18/6 18/10 18/12	24/4 25/3 26/16 26/16 28/4 28/24 29/17 29/20	13/23 16/10 18/16 27/9 27/18 29/1 29/8 32/14	<b>employees [3]</b> 33/11 46/13 46/14
<b>continued [1]</b> 40/15	18/18 18/25 29/20	32/1 32/4 33/24 36/20	33/8 34/22 37/21 37/23	encourage [1] 46/8
continues [1] 45/12	29/25 30/3 38/22 38/25	51/10 52/16	41/12 41/13 41/14	encouraged [1] 37/10
continuing [1] 45/6	December 2021 [2]	didn't [11] 17/20 19/13	41/19 51/22 52/1	end [11] 22/25 26/20
contract [9] 11/1 11/3	29/20 38/22	20/12 25/13 31/17 39/4	does [26] 11/7 11/22	26/22 28/4 32/9 40/22
11/23 11/24 12/2 12/3 12/5 27/3 50/6	decide [4] 14/16 26/12	39/25 48/18 54/7 54/8	19/17 24/11 24/16	42/17 42/18 46/21 51/3
contradict [5] 28/9	29/15 29/16	54/19	24/17 25/16 28/6 28/22	
29/1 31/3 50/25 52/2	decided [1] 27/15	differ [1] 26/24	29/14 31/23 32/24 33/9	engage [2] 48/13 48/16
contradicted [1] 28/13	decision [16] 8/18	different [8] 9/17 13/24	34/5 35/8 35/24 36/6	engaged [1] 47/16
control [2] 10/13 10/23	11/15 11/17 16/5 17/2	22/11 22/12 23/16 25/5	38/2 40/5 40/25 42/9	ensure [3] 21/15 21/24
conviction [1] 38/9	18/6 39/1 41/19 42/21	25/23 30/24	47/3 49/19 50/1 50/15	30/12
cook [2] 31/17 32/1	46/25 49/5 49/11 49/13 49/14 49/20 50/11	digit [1] 29/8	54/5 doesn't [3] 31/10 31/16	ensuring [1] 45/3
cooked [4] 36/14 36/15	decisions [2] 18/5	direct [1] 18/20	47/13	entirely [1] 48/5
36/16 37/15	24/17	directed [1] 23/18 directives [1] 32/8	doing [1] 34/22	entities [1] 34/23
copied [1] 16/6	deep [1] 45/11	directly [2] 19/1 34/9	don't [9] 4/20 7/15	entitled [3] 1/10 35/14
copy [1] 39/15	defendants [1] 7/23	director [4] 2/20 2/23	28/12 28/13 33/16	47/11
correct [9] 22/6 29/21	definitely [1] 41/9	4/19 5/20	33/19 33/20 34/4 53/2	Eric [2] 2/22 5/6
36/19 40/11 45/25	defrauded [1] 9/15	directors [1] 33/11	done [2] 46/2 49/9	error [1] 48/11
46/23 46/24 52/5 56/8	defrauding [1] 45/14	disallow [1] 14/5	down [4] 11/2 14/10	<b>ESQUIRE [2]</b> 2/13 2/16
correcting [2] 15/12 16/16	degree [1] 9/12	disconnect [1] 31/13	48/17 54/20	essentially [1] 49/3
<b>correction [1]</b> 16/25	delivered [5] 23/22	discretion [1] 22/22	<b>DR [5]</b> 2/2 6/9 6/20	et [1] 29/11
correctly [1] 8/15	24/19 31/14 37/13	discusses [1] 25/2	7/13 8/7	even [18] 5/10 10/13
correctness [1] 8/17	43/11	discussion [1] 52/12	dramatically [2] 24/2	11/21 13/18 16/23 17/8
corresponding [1]	delivering [1] 19/11	disputing [1] 27/21	25/23	18/3 19/13 20/12 21/18
15/22	<b>demonstrate [2]</b> 29/12 31/7	disruptions [1] 22/25	drank [1] 43/20	27/6 36/8 38/8 39/25
could [16] 23/20 24/22	demonstrates [1]	divided [1] 29/10	dry [5] 36/12 36/14	43/18 45/5 46/7 46/16 ever [2] 12/19 13/12
33/6 34/3 34/7 36/6	27/25	<b>division [14]</b> 4/23 4/24 5/5 12/1 15/12 15/15	36/17 37/15 43/13 due [1] 22/24	every [6] 12/20 13/2
36/12 37/22 41/5 41/9	denial [23] 10/25 12/10	0,0 12/1 10/12 10/10	444 [1] <i>22/2</i> 7	27/10 27/18 44/12 48/7
ı				

## fault [1] 16/16 everybody [2] 5/17 8/7 everyone [8] 3/4 4/21 15/3 48/20 51/8 53/17 54/23 54/25 everyone for [1] 51/8 everything [2] 14/10 52/22 evidence [14] 8/25 10/6 10/6 27/25 28/8 28/9 28/14 28/16 29/12 33/6 33/7 45/22 45/23 46/17 evidentiary [2] 27/22 29/1 exactly [1] 43/15 **example [13]** 19/17 19/25 20/9 30/18 41/6 41/15 50/25 51/17 52/2 52/6 53/6 53/10 54/9 examples [8] 17/11 25/16 30/16 30/25 34/16 41/22 42/1 45/16 Excel [2] 38/18 39/4 Exec [1] 2/23 **executed** [1] 27/1 **executive** [1] 5/20 exercise [1] 22/22 Exhibit [2] 22/19 30/7 exhibits [4] 29/2 29/6 34/8 34/12 exist [2] 12/3 49/18 existed [3] 48/15 48/15 49/19 existence [1] 9/1 exists [1] 9/3 **expected [1]** 19/23 explain [4] 25/7 25/9 31/2 43/18 **explains [1]** 46/12 explanation [1] 24/10 **extent [4]** 7/25 11/8 11/18 25/19 fact [11] 16/21 17/20 20/24 24/7 31/9 31/15 32/1 32/17 36/5 36/21

facts [4] 11/4 18/14 49/12 49/15 factual [1] 31/13 Fahad [1] 45/21 failed [3] 21/19 22/7 41/3 failing [1] 14/2 fairly [1] 15/6 faith [2] 32/16 48/21 fall [3] 22/23 33/25 34/4 false [1] 28/1

Farah [1] 46/9

**FBI [4]** 25/19 27/22 28/12 34/17 FBI's [2] 28/10 29/1 February [5] 12/17 13/2 13/7 20/9 27/13 February 2 [3] 12/17 13/2 27/13 February 22 [1] 13/7 fed [4] 47/8 48/3 48/18 48/18 federal [15] 11/13 15/22 15/23 21/13 22/25 24/21 25/20 25/22 27/2 27/4 30/1 35/7 41/4 42/16 44/8 Feeding [2] 7/24 9/18 feel [2] 39/4 40/11 fell [1] 18/13 few [5] 30/9 30/25 45/16 47/17 50/10 fifth [1] 10/10 fight [1] 45/6 fighting [4] 17/18 20/3 20/7 45/15 figure [3] 23/25 32/3 32/22 figuring [2] 4/15 50/19 file [6] 6/24 16/1 16/7 16/11 39/19 41/24 filed [1] 25/3 filing [2] 25/7 25/8 final [4] 3/9 3/10 43/5 43/7 find [1] 41/21 finding [1] 45/8 fine [1] 4/14 FIRM [1] 2/13 first [16] 10/15 10/24 gave [1] 25/4 general [6] 2/5 2/5 2/9 12/18 13/13 15/14 2/9 2/22 5/7 16/25 19/17 25/21 27/12 28/11 35/4 42/18 general's [2] 5/4 6/5 49/6 50/4 50/10 50/12 get [21] 3/2 6/11 6/14 7/12 7/14 15/12 16/15 fiscal [1] 22/25 17/21 31/22 33/19 41/9 five [4] 18/25 18/25 42/10 42/19 48/17 42/13 43/7 48/18 50/1 50/20 50/24 flavors [1] 30/24 fluid [2] 31/19 43/19 51/6 53/16 53/24 gets [2] 30/2 50/1 folder [8] 16/2 16/6 16/7 29/5 38/18 39/12 getting [3] 5/11 17/24 39/20 41/24 17/24 give [6] 6/17 24/5 folders [1] 39/10 28/22 32/20 45/16 51/6 follow [3] 14/3 35/4 giving [1] 11/14 54/24 glad [1] 43/9 follow-up [2] 35/4 go [18] 4/20 17/10 18/8 54/24 23/20 25/13 26/10 30/5 followed [1] 44/1 34/10 34/13 35/14 40/7 following [2] 28/19 41/20 44/11 50/9 50/19 42/17 food [13] 14/13 14/15 53/9 53/19 53/23 goes [1] 23/9 15/20 19/21 30/13 31/7 going [23] 4/10 4/10 33/2 36/4 36/5 36/6

36/8 36/9 36/14 foods [1] 30/10 foregoing [1] 56/7 form [2] 9/11 24/5 former [1] 46/14 forth [2] 26/25 52/12 forwards [1] 11/23 found [4] 16/1 18/2 19/10 44/13 foundation [1] 12/10 four [2] 10/12 10/21 37/15 fraction [1] 28/21 frame [2] 21/3 34/2 frankly [2] 10/20 49/22 10/4 45/14 fraud [14] 7/24 18/15 18/20 19/3 19/23 20/6 20/23 21/5 26/8 45/11 46/3 46/4 46/8 46/15 fraudulent [9] 14/15 17/12 17/15 17/20 28/1 44/15 45/7 47/10 47/16 fraudulently [1] 45/19 free [1] 40/11 full [1] 56/9 fully [1] 27/1 24/12 24/22 **funds [1]** 45/19 guilty [1] 19/23 further [3] 10/9 18/19 46/7 had [11] 10/11 21/11 **Future [2]** 7/24 9/18 23/16 26/14 28/4 38/10 Gail [5] 1/13 6/25 56/6 47/17 56/15 56/15 gallon [1] 43/22 gallons [1] 43/21 gaps [1] 32/19 gather [1] 17/6 gauged [1] 24/4

39/18 40/14 40/17 46/2 Haji [2] 45/17 45/18 hand [1] 37/24 handed [2] 11/2 43/19 handing [1] 43/21 hands [1] 12/15 hang [1] 3/24 **Hanna [4]** 19/19 19/19 19/20 19/22 happen [1] 47/22 happened [5] 44/17 48/17 49/9 49/11 50/12 **Harah [1]** 45/21 hard [2] 48/21 48/25 has [42] 8/18 9/2 9/20 10/5 10/11 13/22 14/12 14/13 16/1 16/3 17/16 20/2 20/21 21/2 22/9 23/3 26/6 26/7 27/15 27/20 27/24 28/15 29/7 32/7 33/18 33/22 35/5 36/11 36/25 37/20 40/3 45/7 45/23 47/23 47/24 49/8 49/9 49/12 51/23 52/1 54/3 54/22 have [55] 3/8 3/10 3/17 5/23 6/8 6/13 6/16 6/23 7/3 7/16 7/23 9/19 10/10 10/15 14/21 15/9 15/21 16/20 16/22 18/3 19/11 20/18 21/10 22/18 23/13 23/21

15/15 15/25 16/15 25/16 26/2 26/16 32/15 16/25 17/10 17/14 32/24 33/9 34/15 35/8 17/14 18/8 23/15 25/14 36/12 36/12 37/1 38/2 30/4 41/20 42/15 45/16 38/12 38/13 39/6 40/7 46/21 49/25 52/12 40/17 42/4 42/5 42/7 gone [2] 11/10 13/17 good [10] 4/18 4/21 4/25 5/3 5/6 6/4 8/8 32/15 36/17 48/21 goods [3] 36/12 36/14 got [2] 44/18 48/17 government [3] 9/20 5/12 8/7 Graham [1] 31/20 Grand [1] 2/14 granted [2] 11/16 28/4 great [2] 9/21 39/14 groceries [1] 19/11 ground [2] 11/10 13/25 grow [1] 21/7 guidance [5] 23/7 23/12 24/15 37/3 37/4 guidelines [3] 23/3

42/17 43/6 44/11 46/22 51/12 52/12 53/9 54/22 54/25 having [2] 13/1 51/21 head [1] 41/8 health [1] 24/1 hear [10] 3/11 3/23 4/2 4/6 4/7 4/9 4/12 4/12

heard [2] 15/13 52/15 hearing [17] 1/11 3/3 3/4 3/11 3/18 3/20 6/10 7/6 8/1 8/3 10/10 28/3 28/6 28/20 35/22 42/16 48/20

hearted [1] 48/25 heels [1] 49/22 here [35] 3/11 10/14 10/18 10/23 12/8 13/9 15/11 15/16 15/20 16/16 16/23 17/1 17/3 17/17 18/7 18/17 18/23 29/13 30/5 31/13 33/20 34/4 36/20 39/1 41/21 43/11 43/25 45/5 45/10 45/17 45/25 47/14 49/3 50/12 50/15

here's [3] 4/10 10/24 12/14

hereby [1] 56/6 Herrera [2] 2/20 4/19 Hi [1] 5/24 high [1] 44/14 highly [1] 12/8 Hinrichs [5] 1/13 7/1 56/6 56/15 56/15 **history** [1] 12/6 Hold [1] 7/17 Honer [4] 2/21 4/22 53/23 54/7 Honer's [1] 31/3 honest [1] 48/21

Honey [1] 30/23 hour [1] 28/20 House [7] 19/18 19/22 38/2 38/3 38/5 38/10 38/13

housed [1] 15/17 how [15] 12/14 19/16 20/21 23/8 23/22 24/3 26/23 31/2 31/23 32/7 36/20 42/9 43/10 43/15 49/25

hundreds [1] 23/10 hung [1] 4/1

I'd [10] 3/3 8/9 34/21

4/11 8/24 15/11 15/12

		itself [4] 9/15 9/16 10/2		43/24 45/17 45/20 46/9
	<b>[1]</b> 23/10	26/8	kickbacks [1] 46/13	46/11 49/5 53/9 53/24
42/16 50/22 51/8 51/9	initial [2] 29/25 30/6	_	kidney [1] 30/21	looked [1] 44/11
51/15	initials [1] 46/10	J	kind [1] 10/3	looking [4] 25/15
II [3] 4/12 5/17 26/2	injunction [1] 42/16	<b>J.S [2]</b> 46/10 46/10	know [15] 7/15 9/22	36/24 43/15 48/8
	inspect [1] 12/23	January [15] 9/23	17/20 25/3 26/17 31/20	looks [3] 3/22 11/22
m [24] 4/10 4/10 4/11	inspection [2] 12/12	12/15 13/5 18/4 19/5	33/16 33/20 34/1 34/4	27/6
4/25 5/6 5/10 5/24 6/1	27/5	19/25 26/22 27/14	34/11 43/13 43/19	Loomis [1] 2/22
8/24 15/11 15/12 15/15	instead [1] 49/24	27/16 28/12 30/18 34/2	45/13 49/16	loosen [1] 23/7
10/13 10/23 17/13 10/0	instructions [9] 12/18	34/19 38/19 48/14	knowing [3] 9/9 10/3	loosened [1] 25/10
30/4 33/ 19 4 1/20 42/ 10	13/3 13/8 13/16 13/20	January 20 [7] 9/23	28/16	lot [2] 15/13 33/8
43/9 45/16 46/21 54/19	20/20 21/8 27/12 27/14	12/15 13/5 26/22 27/14	knowingly [1] 28/1	Loving [2] 19/18 19/19
ve [1] 4/1	intend [1] 28/7	27/16 48/14	knowledge [1] 33/19	<b>LP [1]</b> 2/17
delitiliable [1] 30/11	intensely [1] 9/20	January 2022 [1] 30/18		lunch [1] 30/14
dentined [2] 10/14	intensive [1] 9/24	Jeanette [2] 2/21 5/1	48/20	<del></del>
21124	intention [2] 26/4	JILL [2] 2/3 6/1	KRISTINE [5] 2/9 5/4	M
uentiny [2] 34/6 34/11	47/18	job [1] 44/22	35/10 40/11 53/11	made [11] 10/18 12/20
mmediately [2] 17/2	interest [1] 34/7	Johnson [2] 2/21 5/1	kristine.nogosek [1]	14/7 14/12 14/13 15/5
+0/13	interests [1] 52/24	Johnson-Reed [2]	2/11	17/15 49/20 51/25
inplicated [1] 23/10	Interim [1] 2/23	2/21 5/1		52/21 53/25
inportant [3] 10/10	internii [1] 2/23	joint [1] 16/2	L	maintained [1] 12/22
10/23 30/1		judged [1] 9/2	language [1] 25/6	majority [1] 24/8
	interrupt [1] 6/21	judged [1] 9/2 judicial [10] 7/15 7/21	large [2] 10/25 31/18	make [9] 16/25 17/12
mproper [7] 11/25	<b>.</b> .	8/9 8/22 10/9 10/19	last [2] 6/15 45/24	21/17 23/19 28/21
14/5 27/16 47/6 47/20	introductions [5] 3/7		last [2] 6/15 45/24	32/13 34/12 50/15
48/4 50/13	3/14 4/16 4/17 6/9			52/13 34/12 30/13
	<b>7</b>	juices [1] 31/19	law [6] 2/13 11/4 15/3	
nclude [2] 31/10 39/10	invalid [1] 20/23	Julius [1] 46/10	49/5 49/6 49/6	makes [2] 11/17 24/17
ncluded [2] 20/24	investigating [1] 9/21	July [23] 8/15 8/19 9/1	least [4] 9/23 29/7	manager [1] 4/22
22/9	investigation [5] 9/24	9/2 18/7 19/7 20/16	32/14 45/18	many [6] 10/13 16/19
ncorporate [3] 10/17	10/5 18/21 21/5 35/16	24/9 26/14 33/17 39/1	leave [2] 46/1 50/23	19/13 30/16 31/6 48/22
15/4 25/11	invoice [4] 19/9 40/23	39/4 39/22 40/9 40/17	left [1] 6/16	Marekegn [1] 19/19
200rroot [4] 41/7	51/4 54/4	46/23 49/5 49/11 49/12	legal [2] 48/6 48/11	MARK [5] 2/13 3/22 5/
49/13 53/8 54/10	invoices [13] 31/7 31/9		legally [2] 15/1 50/18	5/18 7/5
ncorrectness [1] 8/17	31/17 35/22 35/24	July 25 [22] 8/15 8/19	length [1] 33/12	Markets [1] 34/18
ncreased [2] 26/20	35/25 40/21 41/3 41/16	9/1 9/2 18/7 19/7 20/16	less [1] 33/12	materials [2] 31/2
26/24	43/17 43/21 51/2 54/2	24/9 26/14 33/17 39/1	let [5] 34/11 34/12	35/23
ndeed [2] 14/11 14/19	involved [1] 18/15	39/4 39/22 40/9 46/23	52/10 53/13 53/20	matter [5] 1/6 1/10
ndicate [1] 9/15	lowa [1] 2/15	49/5 49/11 49/12 49/13	let's [1] 19/15	8/12 8/14 9/21
	irrelevant [1] 9/5	49/19 50/5 50/11	letter [9] 16/3 24/9 39/3	
ndicted [4] 7/23 9/19 10/2 10/3	is [191]	jump [1] 40/11	39/7 39/24 40/12 46/23	8/16 8/25 11/2 11/6
10/2 10/3	Issa [1] 20/10	June [1] 40/16	50/5 50/11	11/9 11/15 11/19 11/2 <sup>-</sup>
idictilient [6] 1/25	issue [6] 7/5 13/14	just [23] 7/6 11/5 15/13	letting [1] 44/10	11/22 11/24 11/24 12/4
20/0 23/20 33/1 43/11	19/10 19/17 33/17	16/17 16/23 20/5 20/13		12/9 13/4 17/2 18/5
45/20 46/9 49/4	33/18	25/15 30/25 37/21	license [1] 36/9	19/5 30/10 34/2 34/19
ndictments [20] 8/10	issued [4] 12/9 12/15	43/17 44/10 44/16	lied [1] 9/16	38/17 38/19 39/10
5/12 9/5 9/7 9/6 9/14	12/17 18/6	47/12 48/9 49/5 50/10	like [11] 3/3 3/23 8/9	39/11 39/12 39/23
9/25 16/9 16/15 17/9	issues [1] 19/8	51/9 51/21 52/22 53/9	41/20 49/6 50/22 51/8	40/12 41/25 46/1 50/6
17/13 23/22 20/10	issuing [1] 42/21	53/13 53/16	51/9 51/15 53/23 54/23	50/11
32/20 33/10 43/10 40/3	it [90]	Justice [1] 7/22	limited [1] 48/22	May 17 [2] 12/9 13/4
+1/11 49/10 49/10	it's [11] 12/20 16/18	justification [6] 12/13	line [1] 53/25	May 2022 [4] 19/5
	26/4 32/2 33/18 44/16	24/6 50/4 50/5 50/8	link [1] 25/4	39/10 39/11 39/12
30/11		50/12		May 27 [14] 11/2 11/6
ndividuals [2] 9/19	47/18 50/2 50/11 51/18	JUI 12	list [1] 26/20	11/9 11/15 11/19 11/2
19/2	52/3	K	listed [3] 20/8 34/16 38/5	11/22 11/24 11/24 12/
	item [1] 51/11	KAREN [5] 2/3 5/24		
	items [2] 30/16 30/25	7/18 34/25 54/17	little [1] 26/3	17/2 40/12 50/6 50/11
	14- FOOT 40/00 40/00		live [3] 28/2 28/17	MCS [1] 20/1
5/19 10/0 10/9 55/15	its [22] 10/22 10/23			
35/17 39/5 45/9 52/17	12/13 13/2 14/19 22/20	<b>KATHLEEN [6]</b> 2/5 6/5	28/23	MDE [90]
35/17 39/5 45/9 52/17 54/24	12/13 13/2 14/19 22/20 24/14 25/12 26/14	<b>KATHLEEN [6]</b> 2/5 6/5 52/14 53/14 53/20	28/23 long [4] 24/8 30/4	MDE [90] MDE's [6] 12/11 28/18
35/17 39/5 45/9 52/17 54/24 nformed [1] 49/20	12/13 13/2 14/19 22/20 24/14 25/12 26/14 27/19 28/25 35/5 40/3	<b>KATHLEEN [6]</b> 2/5 6/5 52/14 53/14 53/20 53/20	28/23 long [4] 24/8 30/4 30/10 42/9	MDE [90] MDE's [6] 12/11 28/18 32/2 47/10 47/10 50/7
35/17 39/5 45/9 52/17 54/24 nformed [1] 49/20 ngredient [1] 25/12	12/13 13/2 14/19 22/20 24/14 25/12 26/14 27/19 28/25 35/5 40/3 40/20 42/9 42/21 47/25	<b>KATHLEEN [6]</b> 2/5 6/5 52/14 53/14 53/20 53/20 <b>kathleen.reitz [1]</b> 2/7	28/23 long [4] 24/8 30/4 30/10 42/9 look [21] 11/22 19/17	MDE [90] MDE's [6] 12/11 28/18 32/2 47/10 47/10 50/7 MDE-NPS [24] 8/3
35/17 39/5 45/9 52/17 54/24 nformed [1] 49/20 ngredient [1] 25/12 ngredients [7] 23/10	12/13 13/2 14/19 22/20 24/14 25/12 26/14 27/19 28/25 35/5 40/3 40/20 42/9 42/21 47/25 48/6 49/22 51/1 51/13	KATHLEEN [6] 2/5 6/5 52/14 53/14 53/20 53/20 kathleen.reitz [1] 2/7 keep [1] 23/17	28/23 long [4] 24/8 30/4 30/10 42/9 look [21] 11/22 19/17 20/1 20/9 30/5 33/15	MDE [90] MDE's [6] 12/11 28/18 32/2 47/10 47/10 50/7 MDE-NPS [24] 8/3 25/17 26/19 27/24
35/17 39/5 45/9 52/17 54/24 nformed [1] 49/20 ngredient [1] 25/12	12/13 13/2 14/19 22/20 24/14 25/12 26/14 27/19 28/25 35/5 40/3 40/20 42/9 42/21 47/25	<b>KATHLEEN [6]</b> 2/5 6/5 52/14 53/14 53/20 53/20 <b>kathleen.reitz [1]</b> 2/7	28/23 long [4] 24/8 30/4 30/10 42/9 look [21] 11/22 19/17	MDE [90] MDE's [6] 12/11 28/18 32/2 47/10 47/10 50/7 MDE-NPS [24] 8/3

M	43/7	named [1] 20/5	39/10 40/4 40/5 40/7	45/13
MDE-NPS [12] 40/5	misconduct [1] 28/16	necessarily [1] 38/5	40/23 40/25 41/5 41/11	operating [3] 37/6 38/3
40/7 40/23 40/25 41/5	misrepresent [2] 50/2	necessary [1] 37/9	50/23 51/3 51/6 54/3	38/15
41/11 50/23 51/3 51/6	50/14	need [15] 3/20 3/25	54/5 54/8	operator [2] 16/20
54/3 54/5 54/8	missed [1] 6/8	16/10 17/9 24/1 25/9	NPS's [6] 30/8 36/1	44/19
MDE-NPS's [6] 30/8	missing [6] 18/16	28/13 29/14 30/5 33/8	37/16 37/20 38/18	operators [2] 30/10
36/1 37/16 37/20 38/18	18/20 41/11 41/14	33/14 34/21 42/10	41/15	30/12
41/15	41/16 41/20	43/15 50/15	number [5] 9/8 15/19	opportunity [1] 28/22
MDH [3] 2/20 2/21 2/21	MN [1] 2/18	needed [3] 21/14 39/5	29/8 30/2 44/14	order [5] 11/14 11/16
me [11] 4/2 4/12 5/18	Moines [1] 2/15	53/12	numbered [2] 29/5 37/17	23/16 29/14 33/1
7/16 7/18 8/7 33/7	moment [1] 3/7 money [6] 14/14 20/15	needs [5] 29/16 46/25 47/22 48/23 48/24	nutrition [11] 1/7 2/12	organization [1] 18/15 organizations [1]
34/12 40/12 52/10	26/5 47/9 48/18 48/19	negated [1] 12/6	2/20 3/3 4/19 4/22 5/2	22/22
53/13	Monica [2] 2/20 4/18	neither [2] 33/23 40/4	6/12 15/14 15/19 19/24	organized [1] 29/10
meal [18] 12/18 13/3	monitoring [1] 17/7	net [1] 30/21	Nutrition/Partners [1]	originally [1] 54/18
13/8 13/16 13/20 21/20	monitors [1] 21/23	never [7] 13/19 14/7	3/3	other [11] 12/3 12/10
21/22 22/6 22/23 24/3	month [6] 8/16 14/9	14/12 14/13 28/15 37/2	<del></del>	14/25 15/4 28/8 28/25
25/9 25/13 27/12 27/14	29/11 29/11 34/3 39/10	47/24	0	38/4 41/13 42/4 43/3
31/15 32/1 33/1 43/23	month/year [1] 39/10	new [2] 49/12 49/15	Oats [1] 30/24	49/2
meals [19] 14/9 19/11	months [5] 9/23 19/13	next [6] 4/20 5/23 15/9	<b>objected</b> [1] 35/6	ounce [1] 30/22
21/24 22/23 23/5 23/8	30/2 33/24 40/16	35/21 42/15 47/2	objection [1] 35/9	our [21] 3/2 3/6 5/19
23/10 23/14 23/21 23/22 24/7 24/19 30/11	more [6] 9/22 25/23	nine [1] 9/23	obligation [4] 23/4	7/24 8/11 9/18 15/4
31/12 36/23 37/1 37/12	26/3 45/9 45/9 45/16	no [18] 9/25 10/5 10/7	27/17 32/2 52/4	15/11 15/11 17/24
43/10 43/16	Moreover [1] 9/20	13/11 13/15 13/17 24/9	<b>obtaining [1]</b> 45/19	22/10 23/13 25/2 25/7
mean [5] 31/10 31/16	morning [7] 4/18 4/21	24/9 24/10 36/14 37/12	obviously [2] 45/4	25/8 25/10 28/20 36/18
34/3 35/24 49/19	4/25 5/3 5/6 6/4 16/11	38/21 39/23 41/9 47/8	51/23	40/10 50/16 51/23
meaningful [1] 28/23	mounting [2] 45/22	47/8 47/9 49/1	occasions [1] 19/13	out [18] 4/15 18/22
means [2] 3/20 11/24	46/16	NOGOSEK [2] 2/9 5/4	occur [1] 11/16	18/23 18/25 23/25
meant [1] 24/6	move [2] 22/14 43/5	noncongregate [1]	occurred [1] 46/4	30/25 32/3 32/23 33/19
meet [2] 23/25 48/23	moving [1] 19/5	37/7	occurs [1] 12/8	41/6 43/19 43/21 44/14
meeting [1] 22/23	Mr. [2] 3/15 47/2	nonetheless [1] 47/11	October [3] 42/18 42/25 51/6	45/9 48/10 48/14 50/19 53/6
members [4] 5/23 8/7	Mr. Weinhardt [2] 3/15 47/2	Notary [1] 1/14	October 7 [2] 42/25	outbreak [1] 37/9
42/5 50/9	Ms [4] 31/3 53/23 54/7	note [2] 34/12 38/7	51/6	outcome [2] 10/13
memoranda [1] 25/3	54/7	notes [5] 24/9 30/16	odd [1] 52/5	10/23
memorandum [2]	<b>Ms. [3]</b> 37/19 53/22	54/6 54/20 56/9	off [2] 15/11 41/8	over [4] 14/2 33/19
23/13 25/2	54/5	nothing [3] 24/10 45/7	office [4] 2/5 2/9 5/4	46/17 46/17
memory [1] 30/5	Ms. Bemis [2] 53/22	49/12	6/5	own [3] 10/22 10/23
memos [3] 23/3 24/12	54/5	notice [14] 7/15 7/21	officers [1] 33/11	28/25
24/21 mention [1] 7/14	Ms. Ross [1] 37/19	8/9 8/22 10/10 10/19	okay [9] 4/1 4/5 4/6 4/9	owned [1] 19/19
menu [3] 19/9 51/4	much [8] 6/8 8/6 10/4	10/20 10/22 17/13 19/7	5/17 8/8 15/10 53/18	owns [2] 19/19 19/20
54/4	10/5 15/9 22/14 43/4	35/6 35/14 35/15 41/13	54/22	D
menus [6] 31/8 35/23	50/22	notwithstanding [1]	once [4] 6/14 19/3 37/2	<u>F</u>
40/21 40/23 51/2 54/2	multiple [5] 20/1 20/3	9/24	51/18	package [2] 23/20
met [1] 21/24	20/7 23/14 27/21	November [16] 8/16	one [25] 6/16 7/13 7/17	
Microsoft [1] 1/12	must [7] 11/7 11/20	10/16 14/19 18/6 18/10	9/8 10/1 13/2 14/9 14/9	page [3] 46/10 46/12
mics [1] 3/12	13/11 14/4 14/6 17/12	18/12 18/18 27/2 29/20	23/21 24/17 27/19 28/20 35/11 37/16	51/11
might [1] 23/23	37/1	29/25 30/3 38/17 38/22	39/11 41/6 41/14 42/7	pages [5] 24/24 25/2 29/8 30/25 56/8
milk [4] 31/19 43/19	mute [4] 3/12 3/21 4/11 7/7	l .	44/25 47/8 52/4 52/6	paid [7] 18/3 33/23
43/21 43/22	muted [1] 5/10	November 2021 [1] 38/17	53/6 53/9 54/9	40/4 45/12 50/1 50/2
million [1] 46/4	mweinhardt [1] 2/15	November 6 [1] 27/2	one-hour [1] 28/20	50/20
mind [2] 16/23 36/13	my [24] 4/2 4/11 5/10	November of [1] 39/9	ones [3] 32/23 32/23	pandemic [2] 37/4
mine [1] 34/24	6/4 6/9 6/25 7/1 19/17	now [21] 4/2 4/6 4/8	34/13	48/25
minimal [1] 30/12	22/16 23/2 26/3 26/23	8/8 10/9 13/1 13/11	only [12] 11/22 12/21	panel [70]
Minneapolis [1] 2/18	28/6 31/1 33/18 33/19	13/17 17/19 18/8 22/14	12/25 17/19 21/6 26/7	Panel's [1] 42/20
MINNESOTA [13] 1/1	40/25 41/8 41/21 54/6	26/7 29/8 32/19 32/19	28/21 30/12 37/8 38/18	paragraph [13] 22/20
1/11 2/2 2/6 2/7 2/8 2/10 2/11 5/7 5/19 6/2	54/20 54/20 56/8 56/10	36/13 43/5 47/14 49/14	41/3 47/17	26/18 27/24 32/9 33/2
20/11 56/1	myself [1] 54/17	49/19 52/13	opening [7] 3/8 6/11	33/21 34/5 34/12 40/3
minute [5] 6/15 6/16	N	NPS [24] 8/3 25/17	6/14 6/18 7/14 25/15	40/20 51/1 51/13 53/25
6/21 8/24 16/17		26/19 27/24 33/23 35/3	35/5	paragraphs [1] 50/10
minutes [3] 6/14 15/6	name [6] 6/4 6/9 6/24	35/8 37/22 38/17 39/8	operate [2] 38/4 38/14	parents [2] 23/20
	6/25 7/1 29/2		operated [2] 20/11	23/24
	İ	1	1	

P	33/3 34/19 37/23 41/1	production [2] 36/4	22/14 22/16 25/15 35/2	
part [13] 9/10 10/8	41/7 50/6 50/25 52/4	36/5	35/2 35/4 42/4 42/5	referenced [2] 37/21
10/23 10/25 12/10	52/24 53/7 54/6 54/9	Professional [2] 1/13	43/3 52/15	38/10
12/11 23/23 27/18	place [5] 3/6 13/13	56/16	quite [1] 30/4	referencing [1] 15/25
28/15 28/16 36/4 45/24	33/10 33/15 37/10	program [16] 4/19 4/23		reflected [1] 35/25
48/2	placed [3] 9/7 16/2	15/14 15/21 15/22	23/5 26/19 26/21 26/21	Refuge [6] 19/18 19/22
participate [1] 38/8	16/10	15/22 19/24 20/24 24/4 27/1 30/10 37/4 37/6	26/22 28/9 30/9 32/7 32/9 40/20 40/22 41/11	38/2 38/3 38/5 38/13
participating [1] 54/23	<b>plain [1]</b> 50/11 <b>plainly [2]</b> 31/18 31/21	41/4 44/6 44/8	51/1 51/3 51/14 54/1	Refuge's [1] 38/10 refusing [1] 44/5
articular [2] 9/6 10/14	plan [1] 21/22	programs [3] 2/20	54/3	regard [1] 49/4
particularly [2] 10/21	plead [1] 19/23	15/19 21/1	quote/unquote [2]	regarding [6] 7/15
23/9	please [8] 3/15 4/17	proof [4] 44/23 51/19	23/5 41/11	10/11 13/14 37/19
parties [3] 8/2 48/13	24/23 29/2 31/1 34/8	52/18 54/13	quoted [2] 22/20 25/6	42/10 50/24
48/16	41/6 54/8	proper [2] 9/7 14/6	<del></del> -	Registered [2] 1/13
Partners [76]	point [7] 18/22 18/23	properly [6] 8/23 8/23	<u>R</u>	56/16
<b>Partners' [8]</b> 21/15 21/16 36/15 37/14	25/7 25/8 25/10 33/7	12/4 48/3 48/18 48/19	random [3] 41/6 53/6	regulation [2] 32/2
39/17 44/20 45/24	40/18	proposed [1] 26/21	54/9	47/23
17/18	portion [2] 14/3 14/5	proposing [1] 42/23	rather [1] 29/16	regulations [15] 12/21
parts [10] 14/16 14/17	portions [3] 14/7 14/8	prove [3] 46/7 52/4	raw [3] 31/2 31/16	14/2 14/4 15/23 15/23
14/22 14/23 26/12	14/12	53/3	35/23	21/13 24/21 27/2 27/4
26/13 32/3 32/3 47/25	position [6] 13/1 35/13		Re [1] 1/6	30/1 32/16 32/17 41/4
48/1	40/10 47/10 47/11	proven [1] 53/3	read [2] 7/18 50/10	44/1 44/7
oarty [1] 42/6	50/17	<b>provide [15]</b> 3/9 4/17 20/13 21/2 22/5 24/23	ready [7] 30/14 30/17 30/23 31/12 31/18	regulatory [3] 17/4 22/9 46/19
oast [2] 12/7 49/8	positions [1] 50/16 possible [1] 44/16	30/10 36/8 39/25 41/6	31/25 43/16	reimbursement [2]
oasta [1] 30/20	possibly [1] 40/16	44/2 46/18 53/6 53/20	ready-to-eat [4] 30/14	27/11 29/10
pattern [2] 22/23 33/1	potatoes [1] 30/22	54/8	30/23 31/12 43/16	reimbursements [1]
Paul [2] 2/7 2/11	pound [2] 30/20 30/22	provided [21] 12/24	real [1] 44/3	26/5
pause [1] 32/20 pay [6] 14/6 26/5 40/13	preceding [1] 56/8	14/13 16/4 18/2 21/8	realistic [1] 43/22	<b>REITZ [2]</b> 2/5 6/5
47/13 47/15 47/15	predicated [1] 11/9	25/24 26/1 30/13 36/6	really [4] 7/4 21/9	relate [1] 8/1
payment [2] 17/3 17/21	preparation [1] 30/12	36/16 37/2 39/7 39/15	50/19 54/11	related [5] 13/14 19/8
payments [1] 17/12	prepare [1] 14/15	39/16 40/21 41/18	reason [10] 12/25	22/24 25/17 32/6
pending [1] 44/18	prepared [1] 36/9	41/22 43/14 51/2 52/20	18/16 32/21 32/22	relates [2] 19/16 34/9
people [8] 3/11 3/12	preparing [1] 42/15	54/1	37/12 38/21 39/12 41/22 49/24 50/2	relationship [2] 18/20 33/13
23/17 23/18 24/1 30/19	present [3] 2/20 28/2 52/14	provides [1] 14/4 providing [2] 24/13	reasonable [2] 21/2	relatively [1] 32/12
48/21 49/1	presentation [1] 28/21	51/17	26/6	released [3] 24/12 37/5
per [1] 21/13	presented [1] 41/15	Public [1] 1/14	reasons [5] 11/4 15/7	37/5
percent [9] 14/14	pressing [2] 23/25	publications [1] 25/5	19/6 22/12 38/12	relevance [1] 37/23
26/14 29/15 29/17 32/4	48/24	purchased [2] 31/8	receipt [2] 30/19 30/23	relevant [4] 10/13 12/8
32/22 47/12 48/3 50/17 Deriod [3] 9/25 15/6	previous [2] 10/21	31/16	receipts [1] 31/7	25/19 49/16
43/12	29/6	purpose [1] 45/13	received [1] 46/13	remanded [5] 18/11
permissible [1] 24/19	previously [1] 28/2	purposeful [1] 9/9	receives [1] 21/22	18/13 18/18 38/22 39/2
permission [1] 28/2	primarily [1] 7/9	purposes [1] 24/3	recent [2] 7/25 8/10	removing [1] 45/1
permit [1] 48/12	print [1] 54/25	push [1] 45/12	recipes [1] 30/14	Reporter [2] 1/14
perpetrate [2] 47/19	prior [5] 10/12 10/14	put [4] 6/16 23/19	recipients [1] 36/1	56/16
47/20	25/3 36/10 36/10	39/19 41/13	recognize [1] 8/21 recognized [2] 14/25	reporter's [2] 6/24 56/3
ohone [7] 3/25 4/2	probably [2] 9/22 11/12	putting [1] 24/1	47/23	represent [1] 6/6 representation [9]
4/11 4/13 5/10 7/5 7/9	problem [1] 4/6	Q	record [14] 9/2 10/20	41/1 41/7 50/25 51/13
phonetic [1] 45/21	procedure [2] 33/10	Quality [14] 1/7 3/3	12/7 16/13 29/3 32/25	53/7 53/25 54/6 54/9
oick [2] 15/2 23/20	33/15	5/21 6/13 6/19 9/10	34/6 34/8 37/22 38/20	54/12
piece [2] 7/6 45/25	procedures [1] 28/18	9/13 10/1 10/2 10/8	38/23 39/13 45/14	representations [1]
Dieces [1] 16/17 PIN [4] 2/23 20/2 20/2	proceeding [1] 50/7	10/12 11/1 46/11 48/9	50/14	52/23
44/25	proceedings [2] 55/1	quantities [1] 31/18		representative [1] 50/7
PIN's [1] 44/20	56/10	question [23] 7/3 10/9	24/16 27/5	represents [1] 40/19
PIN/PIQC [1] 2/23	process [5] 13/22	22/18 23/2 26/23 28/6	records [10] 10/19	request [4] 12/23
PIQC [66]	21/20 26/11 48/13	31/1 31/22 32/6 34/21	12/12 12/14 24/18 27/6	20/22 21/1 30/8
PIQC's [25] 11/3 22/19	48/16	36/3 39/14 40/25 43/10	29/22 34/16 36/4 36/5	requested [3] 21/4
23/2 26/4 26/19 26/23	produced [1] 36/7	50/23 51/16 52/19 53/1 53/8 53/22 53/24 54/18	50/3 <b>Reed [2]</b> 2/21 5/1	28/2 51/5
26/25 27/18 27/22	<b>product [2]</b> 31/14 35/25	54/22	refer [3] 15/15 22/10	requesting [1] 53/5 require [7] 12/21 12/21
28/16 30/7 30/8 32/10	55,20	questions [11] 3/9	42/1	

<b>D</b>	righto [2] 49/7 52/2	com/o [4] 22/4	36/7 36/0 42/20 44/49	11/22 11/21 E1/10 EE/1
<u>R</u>	rights [2] 48/7 52/3 risk [1] 24/1	serve [1] 23/4 served [5] 23/8 23/15	36/7 36/9 43/20 44/18 47/15 47/16	44/22 44/24 51/18 56/1 stated [6] 16/3 19/6
require [5] 20/18	Robyn [2] 2/23 5/19	31/9 35/24 36/13	sites [21] 9/16 14/14	25/22 35/5 35/21 50/24
22/4 23/23 27/4 27/9	Ross [4] 37/18 37/19	Services [8] 2/21 4/19	14/22 15/2 17/7 17/14	statement [24] 7/15
required [11] 12/19	37/21 38/7	4/23 5/2 15/14 20/2	20/1 20/4 20/11 21/6	7/16 15/16 22/21 26/4
14/16 17/5 21/9 24/13	round [1] 10/15	20/4 20/8	21/16 21/23 26/6 33/12	26/19 27/23 32/10
25/11 26/2 29/23 30/13	route [1] 46/3	set [2] 26/25 49/12	38/5 44/15 45/2 45/3	32/12 32/13 33/3 33/22
44/6 46/19	<b>RPR [1]</b> 56/15	sets [1] 6/18	45/18 45/21 48/22	35/6 40/3 40/20 50/22
requirement [6] 13/12 13/17 13/19 22/7 27/11	rule [1] 35/14	settings [3] 36/17	situation [2] 9/17	51/1 51/14 51/22 52/1
37/2	rules [3] 25/10 25/11	37/10 37/11	49/23	52/2 52/20 52/21 54/1
requirements [11] 14/3	28/20	seven [3] 18/24 18/25	six [1] 29/8	statements [8] 3/8
17/4 21/25 22/2 22/24	ruling [2] 12/9 14/19	25/4	six-digit [1] 29/8	3/10 6/12 6/14 6/18
23/8 24/16 26/20 26/24	rulings [2] 10/22 10/23	several [1] 25/2	Sixth [1] 2/17	43/6 43/7 52/24
26/25 33/1	run [1] 20/4	shall [1] 22/22	skis [1] 33/19	states [3] 30/9 45/21
requires [1] 26/11	running [1] 20/6	shape [2] 9/10 24/4	snacks [1] 30/11	46/9
resolving [1] 8/12	S	Sharepoint [4] 16/2	so [70]	status [1] 44/18
resources [1] 9/21	safe [1] 23/17	29/5 38/18 39/17	so-called [1] 26/24	stenograph [1] 56/9
respectively [1] 10/16	said [6] 14/20 24/6	<b>Sharmarke [2]</b> 20/10 20/14	solve [1] 7/10	STEPHANIE [2] 2/2 6/9
respond [2] 33/1 40/5	36/25 37/7 53/8 54/20	Sharon [3] 37/18 37/21	Somali [1] 20/11 some [14] 16/16 16/24	still [11] 5/11 19/4 20/2 23/25 42/20 44/2 44/5
responded [2] 47/24	Salad [1] 45/17	38/7	17/11 23/23 26/6 29/13	44/13 44/17 45/10
53/23	same [4] 15/3 16/5	she [1] 53/23	32/19 35/2 35/18 41/12	46/18
response [6] 25/16	25/4 36/23	sheets [2] 38/19 38/21	41/13 48/2 48/3 52/5	STINSON [1] 2/17
30/8 31/4 35/8 36/1	saw [1] 37/13	short [2] 15/6 22/23	somebody [1] 47/19	stinson.com [1] 2/19
52/7	say [10] 7/16 9/4 9/12	shortage [1] 33/2	someone [2] 3/20	Street [3] 2/6 2/10 2/17
responsibility [4]	12/1 39/22 47/4 48/9	<b>should [29]</b> 7/1 7/8 7/9	53/14	strength [1] 12/16
21/15 21/17 51/19 52/9	49/1 51/11 52/10	9/7 10/18 10/19 10/22	someplace [1] 23/20	<b>strong [1]</b> 10/6
responsible [1] 15/18 rest [2] 14/6 15/16	saying [6] 17/20 36/4	11/6 11/11 11/16 13/25	something [1] 49/17	<b>submission [3]</b> 22/19
restate [1] 53/15	36/11 36/13 46/21	15/7 17/21 21/21 30/12	, ,	42/9 44/10
restrain [1] 11/14	51/10	35/13 36/12 37/7 37/8	sort [4] 10/7 31/21 47/7	submissions [2] 29/25
restraining [2] 11/14	says [1] 50/7	38/12 38/13 41/25	52/17	30/6
11/16	scalpel [1] 49/25	44/25 45/1 45/2 47/15	sorts [1] 31/20	submit [7] 12/19 13/1
retained [1] 22/1	Scarver [1] 46/11	47/15 50/18 50/20	South [1] 2/17	13/12 27/18 28/24
retroactively [4] 12/1	scheme [4] 7/24 16/21 20/6 45/11	shouldn't [2] 18/3 39/22	spaghetti [1] 30/20	40/15 44/21
12/6 12/23 27/7	school [1] 49/7	show [8] 10/6 31/8	speaking [2] 3/13 4/23 specific [5] 17/14	submitted [29] 12/12 13/10 13/21 13/22 17/8
reverb [1] 5/11	schools [1] 37/10	31/17 32/25 41/3 41/7	24/24 25/6 25/23 37/23	18/3 18/9 20/14 20/17
reversal [1] 35/20	screen [3] 6/15 7/1 7/8	53/7 54/9	specifically [2] 25/17	20/21 21/18 27/13 28/1
reverse [6] 11/6 11/7	search [3] 25/24 25/25	showed [2] 35/22	37/7	29/5 29/7 29/20 31/6
29/14 49/14 52/17	37/19	35/23	specificity [1] 26/1	32/15 33/5 35/23 38/13
54/13	second [2] 7/18 12/7	shown [1] 16/20	spend [1] 48/19	38/20 38/23 39/13 40/8
reversed [10] 11/11 11/20 13/5 13/5 13/11	Section [1] 24/14	<b>shows [3]</b> 30/20 30/23	spent [2] 14/14 48/19	40/14 44/13 47/6 52/22
13/25 15/7 26/10 27/16	Section 226.20 [1]	32/15	<b>sponsor [9]</b> 9/14 9/15	submitting [3] 12/5
50/18	24/14	shut [1] 48/9	16/14 16/16 21/21	17/5 22/8
reverses [1] 48/12	see [9] 7/1 7/3 7/5 21/6	sift [1] 44/22	21/22 44/5 46/6 46/12	substantial [1] 28/14
review [10] 1/12 2/2	32/19 33/15 39/24	signed [3] 20/25 20/25		substantially [1] 23/7
17/7 21/11 21/11 33/8	41/19 52/14 seeing [1] 46/17	44/6	9/15 16/14 16/16 46/6	substantiate [1] 29/9
37/14 40/8 43/11 51/23	seek [1] 26/4	significant [1] 29/12 Similar [1] 51/5	46/12 sponsoring [1] 22/22	substantiated [1] 22/3 substantiating [1] 22/8
reviewed [8] 18/1 18/4	seeking [4] 11/13 29/9	simple [1] 53/1	sponsors [3] 36/21	such [8] 10/5 13/18
36/17 36/18 36/21	35/18 35/19	simple [1] 33/1 simply [6] 10/7 28/22	37/6 51/20	19/9 30/23 33/2 34/17
39/19 40/14 46/22	seeks [1] 27/10	43/17 50/15 51/21	spot [2] 31/19 33/8	38/21 41/14
reviewing [6] 18/9	segments [1] 30/9	53/15	spreadsheet [1] 39/5	sufficient [1] 42/11
21/20 38/1 44/9 44/25	sense [1] 50/15	since [4] 9/23 32/8	St [2] 2/7 2/11	sugar [1] 30/21
49/10 reviews [5] 21/24	September [7] 1/15	42/8 54/8	standing [1] 52/21	Suite [2] 2/14 2/18
24/18 36/23 49/8 49/8	7/21 22/20 35/8 42/11	single [4] 27/10 27/19	start [7] 3/14 4/15 6/12	summaries [2] 38/19
rewrite [1] 12/6	42/14 56/12	44/12 52/6	8/9 15/11 21/21 43/6	41/18
rice [1] 30/20	September 13 [1]	sit [1] 34/4	started [4] 3/2 6/11	summary [6] 22/10
right [13] 5/16 7/11	22/20	site [19] 14/9 18/15	7/12 7/14	37/20 41/15 41/21
18/8 20/18 20/22 21/10	September 20 [2] 7/21	19/10 20/6 20/7 21/23	state [13] 1/1 15/18	41/23 41/25
27/5 43/3 43/15 51/15	35/8 September 28 [1]	29/11 29/11 30/18	17/8 18/4 21/18 22/4	supervisor [3] 2/21
52/8 52/13 54/6	42/11	31/11 31/15 31/16 32/1	22/21 36/21 37/22	2/21 5/1
	<del>                                    </del>			

S	terms [2] 33/20 49/25	44/21 45/14 49/19	true [4] 10/24 21/16	validated [1] 44/12
	testimony [3] 28/3	49/20 50/15 51/21	45/3 56/9	validity [1] 35/18
supper [1] 30/15	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
supply [2] 22/24 27/9	28/7 28/23	they're [6] 28/19 29/4	truth [1] 48/17	value [1] 27/22
support [28] 2/21	than [5] 9/17 9/22	29/10 31/25 34/1 36/13	try [9] 14/22 34/11	variation [1] 25/9
12/20 13/2 13/11 13/15	25/23 33/12 41/13	thing [5] 7/14 23/6	39/25 41/21 44/22	vast [1] 24/7
13/18 13/23 19/9 20/17	thank [23] 5/22 6/7 7/2	31/20 36/19 49/10	47/18 48/17 48/23 49/1	vendor [2] 16/20 19/21
24/14 24/22 27/10	7/19 8/4 8/6 15/8 15/10	things [10] 8/22 9/6	trying [2] 48/22 49/3	vendors [1] 9/16
27/18 28/14 29/22 31/6	22/12 22/13 36/2 43/1	23/19 26/17 31/10	turn [1] 26/5	verify [2] 33/10 52/19
34/18 36/22 36/22	43/3 43/8 46/25 47/1	31/18 31/21 31/23	two [8] 9/14 10/14	versus [2] 45/21 46/9
38/11 40/21 40/23	47/3 50/21 51/8 52/11	31/24 32/20	34/17 34/23 37/21	very [17] 6/8 8/6 9/17
	54/14 54/21 54/23	think [20] 3/24 7/6 7/7	37/23 49/6 52/13	12/10 15/9 17/15 18/22
46/19 51/2 51/4 51/22	that [371]	7/8 10/6 19/1 25/4 25/5	type [2] 28/25 36/23	20/6 22/14 23/7 29/12
54/2 54/4	that's [23] 4/14 10/24	25/6 25/17 25/21 29/12	types [2] 28/8 41/14	36/25 43/4 44/14 47/17
supported [1] 21/12	15/1 18/7 18/22 23/22	33/4 34/13 34/20 42/20		50/4 50/22
supporting [1] 30/17	30/2 32/11 32/18 32/21	46/24 50/13 52/2 52/4	U	vetting [1] 42/9
supports [2] 36/15	32/22 33/17 36/17	thinking [1] 48/8	U.S [1] 7/22	via [1] 1/12
51/18	36/18 39/18 39/19		uncovered [1] 17/22	
supposed [6] 13/12		thinks [2] 31/23 31/24	under [9] 13/20 15/22	victim [4] 26/8 46/3 46/8 46/14
15/1 17/6 42/8 52/6	39/24 42/13 45/4 45/24	this [85]		
53/3	48/5 49/3 49/24	those [58]	18/13 21/25 23/12 32/2	view [2] 8/11 26/23
<b>supposedly [1]</b> 19/20	their [14] 17/7 20/17	though [2] 5/10 15/5	35/14 45/18 45/21	violated [1] 14/1
sure [6] 7/20 21/17	21/6 21/23 21/23 28/19	thousands [2] 29/7	understand [3] 16/19	W
30/6 42/18 52/13 53/21	36/13 36/22 36/23	32/14	20/1 49/23	
suspension [8] 12/15	39/18 44/9 45/2 48/22	through [19] 3/5 4/12	understanding [3]	wait [2] 39/9 54/24
12/16 13/5 13/6 13/6	51/22	4/13 6/9 7/9 8/16 17/10	40/10 52/23 53/12	waived [1] 37/2
	them [15] 12/23 15/5	17/14 18/5 19/5 20/6	Understood [1] 54/14	waiver [1] 37/7
13/7 27/15 27/16	18/25 23/15 29/18	26/10 33/5 34/19 38/17	unfortunately [1]	walk [1] 3/5
suspicion [1] 20/23	31/17 32/1 34/2 41/19	39/9 41/24 44/11 44/22	48/14	want [14] 18/22 19/17
system [1] 22/4	44/13 47/13 48/2 48/8	throughout [3] 15/16	United [2] 45/20 46/9	20/15 33/19 35/11 36/3
Т	48/8 49/17	37/3 38/9	unitized [4] 19/11 37/1	36/19 40/11 43/9 45/25
	then [19] 3/8 3/10 4/16		43/16 43/23	47/13 52/11 53/9 54/16
table [1] 23/15	5/23 6/15 6/16 7/18	time [21] 3/8 6/17 8/20	unpackaging [1] 23/23	
take [12] 3/6 8/22	11/7 11/10 11/18 12/17	10/5 12/19 15/6 16/5	unquote [3] 23/5 28/9	38/11
10/19 10/19 10/22	l .	21/2 27/12 30/4 32/5	41/11	warning [1] 26/21
17/13 24/5 35/11 35/15	15/12 21/10 25/4 26/5	l .		
49/15 50/16 54/20	31/8 48/3 48/12 49/16	34/2 39/17 39/21 39/22	unsealed [2] 9/25	warrant [2] 25/24
taken [3] 1/12 9/3	there [36] 3/8 6/8 9/6	42/6 42/12 42/19 43/12	28/12	25/25
10/11	10/7 13/11 13/14 13/17	49/21 53/22	unsupported [2] 11/3	was [95]
takes [1] 7/21	13/18 13/24 14/11 15/5	Timeline [1] 41/25	47/6	wasn't [6] 17/22 31/15
taking [1] 35/6	20/20 20/22 23/15 24/9	times [1] 23/14	until [5] 11/24 12/4	36/15 36/16 50/8 54/12
talk [4] 7/9 8/24 19/15	28/15 32/15 32/19 33/5	titled [1] 41/23	17/22 42/17 51/6	wasted [2] 14/15 47/9
26/3	33/15 37/12 37/18	today [34] 3/4 4/24 6/6	up [12] 3/24 4/2 11/24	
talking [1] 34/14	38/11 38/21 39/6 39/12	6/10 8/13 8/14 15/5	12/4 14/10 19/16 23/20	12/4 12/7 13/25 23/16
tat [1] 37/9	39/23 41/12 41/25 42/1	15/20 15/25 16/7 16/20	28/4 29/10 35/4 52/6	23/18 23/25 24/4 24/17
	43/2 45/18 45/23 47/8	16/24 17/1 17/3 17/14	54/24	25/9 38/14 49/15 53/14
Taubel [2] 2/22 5/7	47/9 48/20	17/17 17/25 18/7 18/18	updated [1] 41/25	ways [2] 10/13 24/19
team [4] 3/16 21/11	there's [2] 24/9 24/10	18/24 20/3 20/7 28/17	upload [2] 13/17 19/14	
36/18 51/23	these [25] 11/8 11/18	39/1 43/18 43/25 44/20	uploaded [3] 13/15	we'll [2] 51/6 52/13
Teams [2] 1/12 7/7	14/2 14/12 14/16 14/17	44/21 45/6 45/15 45/25	19/8 39/18	we're [10] 15/19 16/23
<b>Tech [2]</b> 19/1 25/17	16/15 17/9 17/25 20/2	47/25 50/23 54/23	upon [2] 26/21 32/14	17/10 18/7 26/9 28/17
technical [3] 7/5 30/9	20/3 21/1 26/24 30/24	today's [3] 8/1 8/3 28/6		34/14 39/1 42/15 45/10
31/3				
tell [4] 30/6 34/13 36/6	31/2 33/24 37/21 37/23	together [1] 23/19	us [9] 4/8 24/5 32/20	we've [4] 16/10 36/24
44/11	44/3 45/6 46/20 47/17	took [4] 9/1 12/9 27/17	36/6 40/12 42/14 44/11	44/18 47/17
telling [1] 17/16	48/1 48/22 49/25	39/16	50/23 51/17	web [1] 25/4
temporary [3] 11/13	they [41] 9/12 9/14	top [1] 41/8	USDA [13] 14/1 14/3	week [15] 16/9 16/21
11/15 42/16	12/21 17/6 17/20 18/3	Tousignant [2] 2/23	15/19 23/3 23/7 23/18	17/22 18/23 19/3 19/16
ten [1] 6/13	20/13 20/14 20/25	5/19	23/24 24/12 24/15	19/22 20/5 20/10 26/7
tens [2] 29/7 32/14	21/18 21/19 22/11	Tower [2] 2/6 2/10	24/21 25/5 36/20 36/25	
	23/24 28/13 29/5 34/4	training [1] 45/2	used [4] 34/18 37/8	44/14 49/6
terminate [4] 11/3	37/1 38/14 39/17 40/17	transactional [1] 34/15		week's [1] 23/21
11/23 12/2 17/2	42/5 43/10 43/19 43/21	transcript [3] 56/7 56/8		weight [1] 30/21
terminated [2] 40/13	44/1 44/1 44/2 44/4	56/10		<b>WEINHARDT [6]</b> 2/13
40/18	44/6 44/10 44/11 44/11	transformed [1] 31/11	V	2/13 3/15 5/10 5/18
termination [2] 11/1	44/12 44/13 44/16	tried [1] 3/23	valid [6] 11/21 18/2	47/2
50/6	,,			· ·
00/0			21/14 21/17 22/8 45/2	weinhardtlaw.com [1]

\A/	withhold [41, 17/2		
W	withhold [1] 17/3 within [6] 4/22 15/2		
weinhardtlaw.com	15/17 42/20 48/6 52/3		
[1] 2/15 welcome [1] 3/4	without [5] 24/1 26/15		
well [10] 5/16 5/19	26/21 48/8 48/8		
11/16 12/14 19/20	witness [2] 28/3 28/17		
32/11 42/20 47/12	witness's [1] 28/7		
48/15 50/9	witnesses [2] 28/5 28/25		
went [7] 13/6 13/7 13/8	wonderful [1] 54/25		
32/9 33/5 35/25 48/14	words [3] 3/10 12/3		
were [65]	14/25		
what [61] what's [3] 25/12 25/12	work [5] 5/17 14/21		
53/12	44/5 44/17 50/19		
whatever [1] 23/23	working [1] 48/21		
when [16] 3/12 9/3	works [1] 4/5		
9/25 13/5 13/6 17/5	world [1] 23/13 worth [1] 23/21		
20/22 20/25 22/23 23/8	would [27] 14/21 22/10		
24/6 24/17 29/19 38/1	23/21 23/22 26/2 28/14		
44/6 53/8 <b>where [7]</b> 26/6 34/4	30/5 33/6 33/8 33/14		
39/24 44/18 51/17	36/7 39/6 42/1 42/4		
53/22 53/22	42/11 42/20 42/24 46/8		
whether [8] 8/15 20/20	48/12 48/15 50/9 50/14 50/24 53/6 53/9 53/23		
31/13 31/15 33/10 48/6	54/23		
49/13 54/11	WRIGHT [1] 56/2		
which [39] 3/7 9/13	written [2] 15/4 33/15		
11/16 11/24 12/7 13/20 14/7 14/8 14/16 14/17	wrong [2] 11/3 50/18		
14/22 14/23 19/20	wrongdoing [6] 9/9		
21/10 24/19 25/10 26/6	10/3 10/7 28/15 45/24		
26/11 27/10 28/3 28/19	46/2		
28/20 29/9 30/4 32/3	Υ		
32/3 32/23 32/23 33/6	Yeah [6] 35/1 36/2		
34/8 34/13 41/19 41/23	37/25 38/24 39/14 51/9		
43/19 45/18 46/3 48/13 50/13 54/7	year [6] 8/15 9/22		
while [2] 4/15 35/22	22/25 37/4 37/6 39/10		
<b>who [14]</b> 5/20 9/19	<b>yes [7]</b> 3/17 4/3 6/22 7/4 34/21 35/10 42/7		
20/5 44/25 45/1 45/2	yet [3] 44/1 47/10 50/6		
46/12 47/19 48/17	you [80]		
48/18 50/1 50/1 50/19	you'll [2] 4/11 39/24		
54/20 whole [1] 49/23	you're [3] 42/22 48/9		
why [4] 4/20 16/16	53/15		
50/14 54/7	your [16] 3/12 3/15		
will [41] 3/2 3/4 3/6 3/7	3/24 3/24 6/14 6/17 7/5 7/7 7/8 7/9 22/18 24/20		
3/7 3/8 3/9 3/10 3/12	24/24 43/7 50/22 52/8		
3/14 3/15 3/20 4/15			
4/23 5/17 5/23 6/10 6/11 6/12 6/13 6/15	<u>Z</u>		
6/16 6/17 6/17 7/12	zero [1] 14/13		
7/18 8/5 9/4 9/13 15/9			
22/14 35/1 35/2 40/7			
43/5 43/6 43/6 52/11			
52/13 53/16 54/24			
willing [1] 14/21			
window [1] 48/14 wish [2] 8/2 40/5			
withdraw [1] 26/2			
withdrawn [2] 16/22			
17/16			
		/	

## **Exhibit D**

September 26, 2022

Dr. Stephanie Burrage, Panel Chair Jill Bemis, Panel Member Kristie Anderson, Panel Member Minnesota Department of Education 400 NE Stinson Blvd. Minneapolis, MN 55413

Via Email to: Allison Loomis
Appeals Coordinator

Re: In re: Partners in Nutrition d/b/a Partners in Quality Care's appeal of May 27, 2022 Agency Decision

Dear Members of the Appeal Panel:

The Minnesota Department of Education—Nutrition Program Services ("MDE-NPS) asks the Appeal Panel to take judicial notice of the 6 Indictments and 3 Criminal Information Complaints unsealed by the United States Attorney's Office on September 20, 2022. These are publicly available documents related to the May 20, 2022 search warrant Affidavit upon which MDE-NPS' May 27, 2022 agency decision is based. Copies of these federal documents are available in the record of MDE-NPS' denial of Partners in Nutrition d/b/a Partners in Quality Care's ("PIN") November 2021 through 2022 Child and Adult Care Food Program claims.

In particular, the Farah, et al. superseding indictment (Case Number 22-CR-00124) and the Salad, et al. indictment (Case Number 22-CR-00226), refer to an unidentified sponsor identified as "Sponsor A." The Salad indictment states plainly, "Most of the sites operating under the sponsorship of Sponsor A fraudulently inflated their claims in order to appear that they were providing more food to children than was true." The Farah indictment, for its part, in paragraphs 61-70, includes facts confirming that the J.S. mentioned in the May affidavits giving rise to the May 27, 2022 termination letter, was a board member of Sponsor A, and at the time they were a board member, was actively engaged in making fraudulent claims. At the appeal hearing held Friday, September 23, relating to MDE-NPS's denial of PIN's November 2021 through May 2022 claims, PIN's attorney agreed that PIN was "Sponsor A."

Sincerely,

KRISTINE K. NOGOSEK Assistant Attorney General

cc: Mark Weinhardt (via email only)